# DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 066 146 24 HE 003 399

| | |
|---|---|
| AUTHOR | Alford, Howard Lee |
| TITLE | The Impact of Special Admissions Programs on General Admissions Policies in Five San Francisco Bay Area Public Institutions of Higher Education 1966-1971. |
| INSTITUTION | Stanford Univ., Calif. |
| SPONS AGENCY | Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C. Bureau of Educational Research and Development. |
| BUREAU NO | BR-2-I-032 |
| PUB DATE | 1 Jul 72 |
| GRANT | OEG-9-72-0036 |
| NOTE | 367p. |
| EDRS PRICE | MF-$0.65 HC-$13.16 |
| DESCRIPTORS | *Admission (School); *Disadvantaged Youth; *Educationally Disadvantaged; *Higher Education; *Open Enrollment; Special Programs |

ABSTRACT

This study researched the impact of special admissions programs on general admission policies in 5 San Francisco Bay area colleges and universities during a period of 5 years ending June 1971. The study was conducted to determine more specifically: (1) what general admissions policies were waived for special admissions students; (2) what was the quality of services provided students in the area of financial aid, counseling, tutoring; (3) how did the ethnic population of the student body and graduates change as a result of the special admissions programs; (4) how did the special admissions students perform as compared with other students from similar socioeconomic backgrounds; (5) how did the special admissions students perform as compared to the general student body; (6) what were the relative differences in admissions policies of the several institutions studied; and (7) what specific procedures, variations, and policies of the special admissions programs were incorporated into the general admissions policies during the 5-year period. (Author/HS)

ED 066146

HE

"THE IMPACT OF SPECIAL ADMISSIONS PROGRAMS
ON GENERAL ADMISSIONS POLICIES IN FIVE
SAN FRANCISCO BAY AREA PUBLIC INSTITUTIONS
OF HIGHER EDUCATION 1966-1971"

BY HOWARD LEE ALFORD, PhD.

STANFORD UNIVERSITY, PALO ALTO, CAL.
JULY1 1972

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

ED 066146

BR 2-I-032
PA 24

# THE IMPACT OF SPECIAL ADMISSIONS PROGRAMS ON GENERAL ADMISSION POLICIES IN FIVE SAN FRANCISCO BAY AREA PUBLIC INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION

(1966-1971)

BY

Howard Lee Alford

July 13, 1972

A RESEARCH PROJECT IN THE ADMINISTRATION
of HIGHER EDUCATION

Copy of Report Final sent to O.E. Mr. [illegible] RO IX 50 [illegible] SF

July 13, 1972

REPORT NUMBER: FOUR (4) - FINAL

TO:
DIRECTOR OF EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH
UNITED STATES OFFICE OF EDUCATION
50 FULTON STREET
SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA 94102

FROM:
HOWARD LEE ALFORD
1335 Canton Drive
MILPITAS, CALIFORNIA 95035

RE:
"THE IMPACT OF SPECIAL ADMISSIONS PROGRAMS ON GENERAL ADMISSIONS POLICIES IN FIVE SAN FRANCISCO BAY AREA PUBLIC INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION (1966-1967 through 1970-1971)

ATTENTION:
MR. JOHN THORSLEV,
CONTRACTING OFFICER REGION IX

---

Howard Lee Alford 7-13-72
HOWARD LEE ALFORD JULY 13, 1972

---

Standard Form 1034
7 GAO 5000
1034-113

# PUBLIC VOUCHER FOR PURCHASES AND SERVICES OTHER THAN PERSONAL

VOUCHER NO

SCHEDULE NO

PAID BY

U.S. DEPARTMENT, BUREAU, OR ESTABLISHMENT AND LOCATION

Department of Health, Education
and Welfare
50 Fulton St.
San Francisco, California 94102

DATE VOUCHER PREPARED July 13, 1972

CONTRACT NUMBER AND DATE (957) 3-8-72
OEG-9-72-0036

REQUISITION NUMBER AND DATE 2-1-032

PAYEE'S NAME AND ADDRESS

Howard Lee Alford
1335 Canton Drive
Milpitas, California 95035

DATE INVOICE RECEIVED

DISCOUNT TERMS

PAYEE'S ACCOUNT NUMBER

GOVERNMENT B/L NUMBER

SHIPPED FROM TO WEIGHT

| NUMBER AND DATE OF ORDER | DATE OF DELIVERY OR SERVICE | ARTICLES OR SERVICES (*Enter description, item number of contract or Federal supply schedule, and other information deemed necessary*) | QUANTITY | UNIT PRICE | | AMOUNT [1] |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | COST | PER | |
| | | Grant Amount Approved $9700<br>Less Previous Payment: 7045.<br>Balance in Grant Account $2655<br>Current Payment Number 4 $2655<br>Unpaid Balance Available - 0 -<br>Howard L Alford 7-13-72<br>Howard Lee Alford 7-13-72 | | | | |

(Use continuation sheet(s) if necessary)

(Payee must NOT use the space below)

TOTAL

PAYMENT:
☐ COMPLETE
☐ PARTIAL
☐ FINAL
☐ PROGRESS
☐ ADVANCE

APPROVED FOR =$

EXCHANGE RATE =$1.00

DIFFERENCES

BY [2]

TITLE

Amount verified; correct for

(*Signature or initials*)

Pursuant to authority vested in me, I certify that this voucher is correct and proper for payment.

(*Date*) (*Authorized Certifying Officer*) [2] (*Title*)

ACCOUNTING CLASSIFICATION

PAID BY

CHECK NUMBER ON TREASURER OF THE UNITED STATES

CHECK NUMBER ON (*Name of bank*)

CASH
$

DATE

PAYEE [3]

PER

TITLE

---

[1] When stated in foreign currency, insert name of currency.

[2] If the ability to certify and authority to approve are combined in one person, one signature only is necessary; otherwise the approving officer will sign in the space provided, over his official title.

[3] When a voucher is receipted in the name of a company or corporation, the name of the person writing the company or corporate name, as well as the capacity in which he signs, must appear. For example: "John Doe Company, per John Smith, Secretary", or "Treasurer", as the case may be.

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE : 1967 O - [illegible]

July 13, 1972

PUBLIC VOUCHER FOR PURCHASES AND SERVICES OTHER THAN PERSONAL (CONTINUED) BRIEF DIGEST OF EXPENDITURES FOR MONTH OF JUNE-JULY

| | DESCRIPTION OF EXPENDITURE | AMOUNT OF EXPENDITURE | PROJECT BALANCE |
|---|---|---|---|
| (1) | SALARY: 40 Man days professional @ $60. per da. Data analysis and continued related resrch | $ 2,400 | $2655 |
| (2) | SUPPLIES AND MATERIALS: Purchased, reproduced and preparing materials, reports, (purchased materials re: report) | $ 78 | |
| (3) | SECRETARIAL SERVICES: Typing, and preparation of reports, materials and other supplies relative to purpose | $ 57* | |
| (4) | TRAVEL: Use of private vehicle for travel throughout the San Francisco Bay Area. | $ 80 | |
| (5) | COMMUNICATION: Telephone calls and written communication to individuals, institutions, and other relative to the prosecution of project objectives. | $ 40 | |
| (6) | TOTAL EXPENDITURE.................... | $ 2,655 | |

(7) UNPAID BALANCE IN PROJECT ACCOUNT..OEG-9-72-0036(057)... -0-.

Howard Lee Alford July 13, 1972

HOWARD LEE ALFORD, RESEARCH DIRECTOR July 13, 1972

*Final preparation, typing and secretarial cost exceeded an additional $300.00

I certify that I have read this thesis and that in my opinion it is fully adequate, in scope and quality, as a dissertation for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

(Principal Adviser)

I certify that I have read this thesis and that in my opinion it is fully adequate, in scope and quality, as a dissertation for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

St. Clair Drake

I certify that I have read this thesis and that in my opinion it is fully adequate, in scope and quality, as a dissertation for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

I certify that I have read this thesis and that in my opinion it is fully adequate, in scope and quality, as a dissertation for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

Michael W. Kirst

Approved for the University Committee
on Graduate Studies:

Dean of Graduate Studies

# "THE IMPACT OF SPECIAL ADMISSIONS PROGRAMS ON GENERAL ADMISSIONS POLICIES IN FIVE SAN FRANCISCO BAY AREA PUBLIC INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION"

1966 - 1971

## ABSTRACT

Howard Lee Alford
July, 1972

STANFORD UNIVERSITY

SCHOOL OF EDUCATION

## 1. PROBLEM

This study researched the impact of Special Admissions Programs on General Admission Policies in five San Francisco Bay Area Public Institutions of Higher Education for a period of five years ending June, 1971. The particular determinants addressed were:

(1) What specific General Admissions Policies were waived for Special Admissions Students?

(2) What was the quality of special services provided excepted students in the area of financial aid, counseling and tutoring?

(3) How did the ethnic population of the student body and graduates change as a result of the Special Admissions Programs?

(4) How did the Special Admissions Students perform compared to the general students from similar socio-economic backgrounds?

(5) How did the excepted students perform compared to the general student body?

(6) What were the relative differences in Admissions Policies of the several institutions comprising the basic study?

(7) What specific procedures, variations and policies of the Special Admissions Programs were incorporated into the General Admissions Policies during the five year period?

The data gathered represented the perceptions of College Administrators and this information was compared with the availability of reports and records. This study addressed the problem of providing greater educational opportunity for those students who have been considered "non-college types." The most complicated problem in the study was to ascertain the significant differences and similarities, if any, in the General Admissions Policies and Special Admissions Programs in the several institutions and between the schools studied.

## 2. RESEARCH ASSERTIONS AND EXPECTATIONS

The research assertions and expectations for this investigation were as follows:

(1) Provisions under Special Admissions Programs will be in effect very little different from the General Admissions Policies.

(2) Special variations and provisions employed with the expressed purpose of recruiting and educating more students with minority ethnic identity tended to be temporary and without lasting significant impact.

(3) The average G.P.A. earned by students admitted under "Special" admissions provisions equaled the average G.P.A. earned by the general student body.

(4) The average program and degree progress for Special Admissions students equaled the average program and degree progress for General Admissions students.

## 3. METHODOLOGY

The methodology used in this research was primarily historical in the sense that the records of Special Admissions Programs were traced over a period of five (1966-1971) years at the five institutions.

Before collecting data, the Admissions Officer and his associate or assistant were identified at the specific institutions used in the population of this study. The Director of Educational Opportunity (EOP) Program and the Director of Financial Aid were subsequently identified.

Appointments with these interviewees were made in advance, and each administrator was then interviewed separately.

A focused interview questionnaire had been developed earlier; it was used to gather the basic data. Responses were recorded during the interview and on the instrument used.

Distinctions were made between the College Administrators' "perceptions" or "estimate" where applicable on the focused interview data gathering instrument.

During interviews, the word "hard" was written beside any and all data which represented "factual" or written information taken from a report or records.

Subsequent to the interview, each administrator was thanked for their cooperation then presented with a list of reports needed to complete the data gathering process and respectfully requested to provide information relative to his/her respective office.

This was a study in the administration of Higher Education. It sought to identify the impact of Special Admissions Programs on General Admission Policies in each institution during the five years between 1966-1967 and 1970-1971, inclusively.

The analysis of the data was primarily the process of organizing the collected data, relating and comparing them to the potential and practical influence on admissions policies in institutions of higher learning for greater equality of educational opportunity. Treatment of the data indicated specific alternatives and procedures implemented by the institutions studied and determined what happened, the variations of determinants, and the relative effectiveness of actions taken.

## 4. IMPORTANT FINDINGS

The important findings in this study as indicated by both the responses of interviewees and the information contained in reports and records suggest the following:

(1) The General Admissions Policies waived for Special Admissions students were grades, test scores and rank in high school graduating class. These three determinants constituted as eligibility index by which regular students were admitted. In actuality, however, special students were expected to have good character references, interviews and recommendations from a state approved list of community groups.

(2) The quality and consistancy of services provided Special students...i.e., financial aid, counseling, and tutorial was less than adequate for most years in each institution. This factor was apparently the result of inadequate financial resources and the unavailability of competent counselors and tutors.

(3) The ethnic population of students and graduates changed slightly over the five year period in each school. However, this relative change was seen as insignificant when the growth in enrollments were considered (as in Sonoma State and Hayward State) and the relative ethnic population of the surrounding communities (as in San Jose State, San Francisco State, and the University of California, Berkeley).

(4) The average performance of Special Admissions registrants seemed to be somewhat less than the average performance of general admits from similar socio-economic backgrounds in the six areas judged, i.e., grades, progress toward degree requirements, social adjustment, academic adjustment, drop-out rate, and time taken to earn the degree.

(5) Excepted students performed about the same, somewhat less or decidedly less than general admits in each school throughout the five year period. The difference in performance seemed to be reflected by the status of the several excepted students. First time freshmen tended to perform decidedly less; transfer students and other second year students, somewhat less; and seniors tended to perform about the same or slightly better than general students.

(6) The relative differences between the admissions policies of the state college requirements were the same while the University of California, Berkeley, required higher grades, test scores and rank in high school graduating class.

(7) No specific procedures, variations or policies of the Special Admissions programs were incorporated into the General Admissions Policies. Special Admissions changed after 1969 in the sense that greater scrutiny of prospective students was made which administrators suggested limited the number and types of students admitted to their institutions.

(8) Interviewees were often hesitant to advance opinions in areas where little or no records were available or in areas of unfamilarity.

(9) Different Administrators had varying opinions and perceptions about the quantity and quality of efforts each school had expanded to provide equality of educational opportunity.

(10) Few records were kept regarding the areas of determinants addressed during this investigations.

(11) Excepted students performed much better and tended to persist when provided the special services required in financing, counseling, and tutoring.

(12) While the California Coordinating Council on Higher Education employed the term "Special" to denote all students registered with EOP, the respective EOP offices in each institution studied preferred to label those students who registered with their office but met the regular admissions criteria as "generals."

(13) The number of ethnic minority registrants tended to level off in each institution studied by the years 1970-1971. While enrollment figures represented significant increases after the paucity of such persons before 1966, the "leveling-off" plateau was not significant when considering proportional need.

## CONCLUSIONS

Some effort has been exerted by these California State institutions of higher learning to expand educational opportunity to more culturally and economically oppressed minorities. This investigation showed clearly that the number of ethnic and lower socio-economic students had increased on these campuses as a result of Special Admissions Programs. Most of this increase to date has been in lower class and freshman ranks. Appreciable numbers of ethnic and/or special graduates have not materialized.

Whether or not this increase in opportunity is worthy of commendation to higher education is highly suspect. At Sonoma State and Cal State, Hayward, the total enrollment had grown rapidly each succeeding year during the five years studied. Increases of Special and minority oppressed students also grew rapidly. Since the proportional number of students rose swiftly, serious questions remain as to whether or not the problem of educating economically oppressed students is being solved.

San Jose State and U. C., Berkeley also showed increases in ethnic minorities, but very little or no increase in total students after 1970. Records and perceptions mirrored at slight increase proportionally in Blacks and Mexican-American students in these two schools; however, this increase could barely qualify for more than "a good start."

This investigation was rather broad and involved. Records were scarce in the several institutions. In many cases, this fact tended to impede the ability to secure bonafide perceptions from respondents about some questions.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

LIST OF TABLES . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . xiii

CHAPTER

I. PROBLEMATIC SITUATION AND DESIGN OF THIS STUDY . 1

Introductory Statement . . . . . . . . . . 1
Traditional Admissions Criteria Used by Colleges and Universities . . . . . . . 1
Tests . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 3
Grades . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 4
Other Traditional Criteria . . . . . . . 5
Summary . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 6
Successes and Failures with Traditional Admissions Criteria . . . . . . 6
Successes . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 7
Failures . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 8
Summary . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 16
Particularly Difficult Problems . . . . . . . 16
Who Should Decide, "Who Should Decide?" . 17
Who Should Go to College? . . . . . . . . 18
Comparison and Reconciliation of Opinions . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 22
Summary . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 23
Emerging Concepts of Expanded Educational Opportunity . . . . . . . . . . . 24
Summary . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 28
Recent Efforts to Provide Equal Educational Opportunity . . . . . . . . . . . 28
Institutional Efforts . . . . . . . . . . 28
State Governments . . . . . . . . . . . . 30
Open Admissions . . . . . . . . . . . . . 31
Federal Government . . . . . . . . . . . 33
Summary . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 35
General Research on Colleges and Institutions . . . . . . . . . . . . . 35
Black NASULGC Enrollments . . . . . . . . 37
Minorities Grow in College . . . . . . . 37
Summary . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 39
Design of This Study . . . . . . . . . . . . 40
The Purpose of This Study . . . . . . . . . . 41

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

Report i

Public Voucher for Purchases and Services Other Than Personal................ ii

Public Voucher for Purchases and Services Other Than Personal Brief Digest of Expenditures for Month of June-July........ iii

Abstract........................................ iv

Problem.............................. v

Research Assertions and Expectations........ vii

Methodology........................... viii

Important Findings........................ x

Conclusions.............................. xiii

TABLE OF CONTENTS (Continued)

CHAPTER Page

I. (Continued)

Definition of a Research Problem . . . . . . 43
Sources and Treatment of Data . . . . . . 44
Basic Data . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 44
Complementary Data . . . . . . . . . . . 44
Supplementary Data . . . . . . . . . . . 45
Methodology of Data Collection . . . . . 45
Analysis of Data . . . . . . . . . . . . 46
Summary of the Design of This Study . . . 47
Some Research Assertions and Expectations
Provisions Under Special Admissions Programs Will Be in Effect Very Little Different from the General Admissions Policies Predating such Programs . . . . . . . . . . . 48
Summary . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 57

II. PRETESTING INSTRUMENTS, A CASE STUDY . . . . . . 60

General Admissions . . . . . . . . . . . . 60
Special Admissions Programs . . . . . . . 62
The Need to Pretest Instruments . . . . . 63
Choosing an Institution for Pretesting . 65
What Was Done at Sonoma State . . . . . . 66
What Was Learned Operationally . . . . . 67
Summary of Findings . . . . . . . . . . . 69
Summary . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 84
Performance . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 89
Summary of Opinion, Special Admission Students Relative to General Admission Students . . . . . . . . . . . 90
Other Findings . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 91
Summary of Research Project at Sonoma State . . . . . . . . . . . . . 91
Chapter Summary . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 95

III. GENERAL ADMISSIONS POLICIES AND SPECIAL ADMISSIONS PROGRAMS . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 98

General Admissions Policies . . . . . . . 98
Special Admissions Programs . . . . . . . 100
Developmental Concepts of an EOP Student; Open Admissions . . . . . . . 101
City University of New York . . . . . . . 101

TABLE OF CONTENTS (Continued)

CHAPTER Page

III. (Continued)

Critics of Open Admissions . . . . . . . . 102
Research on CUNY . . . . . . . . . . . . . 102
Summary . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 107
Concepts of an EOP Student in California . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 107
On the College Campus . . . . . . . . . . 109
University . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 110
Summarizing . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 111
Analysis of Findings . . . . . . . . . . . 112
Identification of Institutions . . . . . 112
Responses . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 112
Summary of Comparative (Institutional) Perceptions . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 115
Similarities . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 115
Differences in (Perceptions) the Four Schools . . . . . . . . . . . . . 117
Summary of Reports . . . . . . . . . . . . 119
Other Reports . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 122
First-Time Freshmen . . . . . . . . . . . . 122
Recommendations for Further Study . . . . . . 125
Chapter Summary . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 127

IV. FINANCIAL AND OTHER STUDENT SUPPORT SERVICES . . 129

Analysis of Findings . . . . . . . . . . . . 129
Summary of Responses . . . . . . . . . . 130
Financial Aid . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 130
Counseling Services . . . . . . . . . . . 134
Tutoring Services . . . . . . . . . . . . 136
Other Services . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 138
Summary Statement . . . . . . . . . . . . 139
Financial Aid Reports . . . . . . . . . . 140
Federal Spending . . . . . . . . . . . . . 143
Chapter Summary . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 145

V. RACIAL AND ETHNIC CHARACTERISTICS OF STUDENTS AND GRADUATES . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 147

Treatment of Cases . . . . . . . . . . . . . 147
Summary of Responses . . . . . . . . . . . . 147
Analysis of Reports and Records . . . . . . . 151
Comparison: Perceptions vs. Records . . 155

## TABLE OF CONTENTS (Continued)

CHAPTER Page

V. (Continued)

Summary of Degrees Awarded . . . . . . . . . . 156
  Undergraduate Degrees . . . . . . . . . . . 159
  Graduate Degrees . . . . . . . . . . . . 159
Major Determinants Preventing Colleges From Reflecting a More Equitable Racial and Ethnic Composition Among Students . . . 160
  Analysis of Findings . . . . . . . . . . 161
  Similarities in Perceptions . . . . . . . 161
  Differences in Determinants Listed by Institutions . . . . . . . . 161
What Colleges Should Have Done . . . . . . . 166
  Analysis of Findings . . . . . . . . . . 166
  Similarities . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 169
  Differences . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 169
  San Jose State . . . . . . . . . . . . . 170
  Cal State, Hayward . . . . . . . . . . . 170
  San Francisco State . . . . . . . . . . . 171
  U.C., Berkeley . . . . . . . . . . . . . 171
The California Master Plan . . . . . . . . . 172
  Analysis of Findings . . . . . . . . . . 172
  Comments from San Jose State . . . . . . 174
  Cal State, Hayward . . . . . . . . . . . 174
  San Francisco State . . . . . . . . . . . 175
  U.C., Berkeley . . . . . . . . . . . . . 175
Chapter Summary . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 176

VI. THE PERFORMANCE OF SPECIAL ADMISSIONS STUDENTS RELATIVE TO THE PERFORMANCE OF GENERAL ADMISSIONS STUDENTS . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 178

Summary of Responses . . . . . . . . . . . . 178
  Comparative Statement . . . . . . . . . . 184
Summary of Part One . . . . . . . . . . . . . 185
Part Two: Performance . . . . . . . . . . . . 186
  Analysis of Findings . . . . . . . . . . 186
  Summary . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 191
  Summary of Available Reports . . . . . . 192
Summary Statement . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 202
  Reports at Cal State, Hayward . . . . . . 203
  Summary Statement . . . . . . . . . . . . 206
  San Francisco State . . . . . . . . . . . 206

TABLE OF CONTENTS (Continued)

CHAPTER Page

VI. (Continued)

Summary Statement . . . . . . . . . . . . . 209
U.C., Berkeley . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 209
Summary Statement . . . . . . . . . . . . . 211
Chapter Summary . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 211

VII. CONCLUSIONS: RESEARCH ASSERTIONS AND EXPECTATIONS REEXAMINED . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 213

Review: Other Findings . . . . . . . . . . 225
Identity Crisis . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 227
Concluding Comment . . . . . . . . . . . 228
Limitations of the Study . . . . . . . . 229
Perceptions of College Administrators . . 231
Value of Administrators' Opinions . . . . 232
Implications for Policy Determination . . 233
Implications for Future Research . . . . 234
Recommendations . . . . . . . . . . . . . 235
Summary . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 235

BIBLIOGRAPHY . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 236

APPENDIX

I-A COPY OF FOCUSED INTERVIEW QUESTIONNAIRE ADMINISTERED TO ADMISSIONS OFFICERS, ASSOCIATE OR ASSISTANT ADMISSIONS OFFICERS, DIRECTORS OF EOP, AND DIRECTOR FOR FINANCIAL AIDS . . . . . 247

I-B LETTER TO ADMISSIONS OFFICERS . . . . . . . . . . . 280

I-C COPY OF LETTER SENT TO TWENTY-TWO EDUCATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS INVOLVED IN SERVICE TO HIGHER EDUCATION IN AMERICA . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 282

I-D COPY OF LETTER SENT TO DEPARTMENTS OF EDUCATION IN THE FIFTY STATES . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 284

II STATE AGENCIES AUTHORIZED TO NOMINATE EOP CANDIDATES . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 285

## TABLE OF CONTENTS (Continued)

APPENDIX Page

III-A TITLE 5 PROVISIONS FOR "SPECIAL" ADMISSIONS IN CALIFORNIA PUBLIC INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 286

III-B THE CALIFORNIA STATE COLLEGES USE OF THE 2% RULE FOR LOWER DIVISION TRANSFERS, FALL, 1966, FALL, 1967 . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 289

III-C THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITY PROGRAM - DISTRIBUTION BY CAMPUS . . 291

III-D CALIFORNIA STATE COLLEGES BASIS OF ADMISSION, FALL 1969, STATE FUNDED EOP ENROLLEES . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 292

III-E CALIFORNIA STATE COLLEGES EOP ENROLLMENT, 1969-70 . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 293

IV-A CALIFORNIA STATE COLLEGES, FISCAL YEAR 1969-70 EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITY PROGRAM, SUPPORT BUDGET FUNDING, INITIAL ALLOCATION, REALLOCATION, AND ACTUAL EXPENDITURES, BY COLLEGE AND SYSTEMWIDE . 294

IV-B CALIFORNIA STATE COLLEGES SUMMARY OF FINANCIAL AID EXPENDITURES FOR NEW EOP STUDENTS, 1969-70 . 295

IV-C UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA SOURCES OF STUDENT FINANCIAL AID . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 296

IV-D UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS AND STUDENT FINANCIAL AID, UNDERGRADUATE EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITY PROGRAM, 1969-70, COST PER STUDENT . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 297

IV-E EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITY PROGRAM SUPPORT IN CALIFORNIA STATE COLLEGES, 1969-70 . . . . . . . . 298

IV-F THE CALIFORNIA STATE COLLEGES, EOP ENROLLMENT PROJECTIONS AND PROGRAM COSTS, 1969-70 THROUGH 1971-72 . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 300

IV-G EOP FINANCIAL AID EXPENDITURES AND PROJECTIONS . 301

TABLE OF CONTENTS (Continued)

APPENDIX Page

IV-H UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, SOURCES OF STUDENT FINANCIAL AID . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 302

IV-I UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENDITURES AND STUDENT FINANCIAL AID UNDERGRADUATE EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITY PROGRAM, 1970-71, COST PER STUDENT . . . . . . . 303

IV-J SOME SOURCES OF INFORMATION ON STUDENT AID . . . 304

V-A THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA ETHNIC DISTRIBUTION OF UNDERGRADUATE EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITY STUDENTS . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 323

V-B CALIFORNIA STATE COLLEGES, ESTIMATES OF ETHNIC BACKGROUND DISTRIBUTION OF FALL 1969 EOP ENROLLEES BY COLLEGE AND SYSTEMWIDE . . . . . 324

V-C UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, ETHNIC DISTRIBUTION IN PERCENT BY CAMPUS TOTAL STUDENT BODY AND EOP PARTICIPANTS, 1969-70 . . . . . . . . . . . 325

V-D THE CALIFORNIA STATE COLLEGES, COMPARISON OF ETHNIC MIX, NEW FALL 1969 EOP ENROLLEES AND TOTAL ENROLLMENT . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 326

V-E UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, NUMBER AND PARTICIPATION RATES OF ETHNIC MINORITIES AT THE UNDERGRADUATE LEVEL AND IN THE EOP . . . . 327

VI-A UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITY PROGRAM STUDENTS BY ADMISSIONS CLASSIFICATION AND MEDIAN GRADE POINT AVERAGE . . 329

VI-B SUMMARY OF ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE, FOR THE CALIFORNIA STATE COLLEGES DURING THE FIRST YEAR OF PERSISTENCE, AND DISQUALIFICATION OF FALL 1968 EOP ENROLLEES . . . . . . . . . . . . 330

VI-C THE CALIFORNIA STATE COLLEGES, PERSISTENCE, PROBATION AND DISQUALIFICATION DATA, FALL 1969, EOP ENROLLEES . . . . . . . . . . . . 331

VI-D THE CALIFORNIA STATE COLLEGES, ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE DATA FALL 1969, EOP ENROLLEES . . . . 332

## TABLE OF CONTENTS (Continued)

APPENDIX Page

VI-E CALIFORNIA STATE COLLEGES, FALL 1969 EOP ENROLLEES NOT MEETING REGULAR ADMISSION REQUIREMENTS, PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS EARNING "C" (2.00) OR BETTER AND "B" (3.00) OR BETTER DURING FIRST YEAR OF STATE COLLEGE ENROLLMENT, BY COLLEGE AND BY BASIS OF ADMISSION . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 333

VI-F CALIFORNIA STATE COLLEGES, FALL 1969 EOP ENROLLEES, MEDIAN GRADE POINT AVERAGE, MEDIAN UNITS SUCCESSFULLY COMPLETED, AND PERCENTAGE OF ENROLLEES SUCCESSFULLY COMPLETING 20 OR MORE SEMESTER UNITS, BY COLLEGE AND SYSTEMWIDE . . . . . . . . . . . . . 334

VI-G UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, NEW EOP STUDENTS 1969-70 WHO COMPLETED SPRING QUARTER 1970 . . . . 335

VI-H UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, NEW EOP STUDENTS 1969-70 WHO DID NOT COMPLETE SPRING QUARTER 1970 . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 337

VI-I TOTAL UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA COMPARISON OF GRADE POINT AVERAGES BETWEEN UNDERGRADUATE AND EOP STUDENTS, 1970-71 . . . . . . . . . . . . . 339

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE Page

II-1 Sample of Eligibility Index for California High School Graduates to Gain Admission to California State Colleges . . . . . . . . . . . . . 61

II-2 Admissions Eligibility Table for California High School Graduates to California State Colleges . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 70

II-3 Estimated Amount of Financial Aid to Students at Sonoma State College for the Years 1966-67 Through 1970-71 . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 73

II-4 Estimated Number of EOP Students Receiving Tutorial Service During the Academic Years 1969-71 at Sonoma State College . . . . . . . . . 74

II-5 Interviewees' Estimates of the Total Student Enrollment by Ethnic Groups from 1966-67 Through 1970-71 at Sonoma State College . . . . . 77

II-6 Ethnic Distribution of Students Admitted to Sonoma State College in the Fall of 1969 . . . . 78

II-7 Ethnic Distribution of All Students in the Hidden Talent Project at Sonoma State College as of December 1969 . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 78

II-8 A Summary of the 82 Students Enrolled in the Hidden Talent Project as of June 1970 at Sonoma State College . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 79

II-9 Summary of Hidden Talent Students Enrolled at Sonoma State College for the Academic Year 1969-1970 . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 80

II-10 Summary of Perceived Total Undergraduate Degrees Awarded at Sonoma State College between 1966-1967 and 1970-1971 . . . . . . . . . . 83

## LIST OF TABLES (Continued)

| TABLE | | Page |
|---|---|---|
| II-11 | Summary of Graduate Degrees Awarded by Sonoma State College Between 1966-1967 and 1970-1971 as Perceived by the Three Administrators Interviewed . . . . . . . . . . . . | 85 |
| II-12 | Significance of Variance between Pre- and Post-Scores of Unsuccessful and Successful Groups at Sonoma State College . . . . . . . . . . | 94 |
| III-1 | Selectivity Levels of Higher Educational Institutions, 1968 . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . | 99 |
| III-2 | Number of Lehman College Freshmen, Fall 1970: A Comparison by High School Averages . . . . . . | 106 |
| III-3 | Comparative Difference in Requirements for General Admissions and Special Admissions Students in Four Institutions of Higher Education as Perceived by Interviewees (1966-1967 Through 1970-1971) . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . | 118 |
| III-4 | Comparison of Class and Entry Status Between Black and Chicano E.O.P. Students at San Jose State College, Fall 1968 . . . . . . . . . . . . | 119 |
| III-5 | Comparison of Academic Status between Black and Chicano E.O.P. Students, Fall and Spring Semester, 1968-69, San Jose State College . . . . | 121 |
| III-6 | Use of Two Percent Rule for First Time Freshmen, Fall 1966, in California State Colleges . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . | 123 |
| III-7 | Use of Two Percent Rule for First Time Freshmen, Fall 1967 in California State Colleges . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . | 124 |
| IV-1 | Summary of Perceived Participation of General Admissions Students and Special Admissions Students in Financial Aid Programs in California Institutions of Higher Education (1966-1967 Through 1970-1971) . . . . . . . . . . | 132 |

## LIST OF TABLES (Continued)

TABLE Page

IV-2 Summary of Estimated Tutorial Effort for Special Admits in Four California Senior Institutions of Higher Education (1966-1967 Through 1970-1971) . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 137

IV-3 Summary of the Racial-Ethnic Students Receiving Financial Aid, San Jose State College (1968-1969 Through 1970-1971) . . . . . . 141

IV-4 Summary of Financial Aid Efforts to Students in Four California Senior Institutions of Higher Education (1966-1967 Through 1970-1971) . 144

V-1 Number of Students Enrolled in Four California Public Senior Institutions of Higher Education (1966-1967 Through 1970-1971) . . . . . . . . . . 152

V-2 Reported Racial and Ethnic Composition of Students in Four California State Public Institutions of Higher Education, Fall 1970 . . . 154

V-3 Estimated Racial and Ethnic Composition of Enrollees in Four California Senior Public Institutions of Higher Education (1966-1967 Through 1970-1971) . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 157

V-4 Comparison of Perceptions and Records Reflecting the Number of Degrees Awarded by Four California Senior Public Institutions of Higher Education (1966-1967 Through 1970-1971) . . . . . . . . . . 158

V-5 Summary of Perceived Determinants Preventing Colleges from Reflecting a More Equitable Racial and Ethnic Composition of Students Relative to the Approximate Racial and Ethnic Population of the Surrounding Communities . . . . 162

V-6 Number of Interviewees in Four California Senior Public Institutions of Higher Education Stating No Perceptions of Important Steps College Could Have Taken . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 166

XXIV

LIST OF TABLES (Continued)

| TABLE | | Page |
|---|---|---|
| V-7 | Summary of Perceived Important Steps Colleges Could Have Taken to Make the Racial and Ethnic Characteristics of Their Student Populace More Reflective of the Approximate Ethnic Population of Surrounding Communities . . . . . . | 167 |
| V-8 | Summary of Responses from Four Institutions of Higher Education to the California Master Plan for Higher Education . . . . . . . . . . . . | 173 |
| VI-1 | Summary of Interviewees' Perceptions of the Average Performance for Special Admissions Students Relative to the Average Performance of General Admissions Students from Similar Socio-Economic Backgrounds in Four California Institutions of Higher Education . . . . . . . . | 180 |
| VI-2 | Summary of Interviewees' Perceptions of the Average Performance for Special Admissions Students Relative to the Average Performance of General Admissions Students in Four California Institutions of Higher Education . . . | 188 |
| VI-3 | Spring Semester Disqualification by Class Level at San Jose State, 1969 . . . . . . . . . . . | 194 |
| VI-4 | Comparison of Academic Status between Black and Chicano EOP Fall and Spring Semester, 1968-69 at San Jose State . . . . . . . . . . . . | 196 |
| VI-5 | Status at End of Spring 1970 of the Black EOP Students at San Jose State Who Entered San Jose State College in Fall 1968 . . . . . . . . . . . | 199 |
| VI-6 | Status at End of Spring 1970 of the Black EOP Students at San Jose State Who Entered San Jose State College in Fall 1969 . . . . . . . . . . | 200 |
| VI-7 | GPA Ranges for First-Time Special Admissions Students Who Entered Cal State, Hayward, Fall Quarter, 1968-69 . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . | 205 |
| VI-8 | EOP Demographic Data at San Francisco State for the Period 1969 Through 1971 . . . . . . . . . . . | 208 |

# CHAPTER I

# PROBLEMATIC SITUATION AND DESIGN OF THIS STUDY

"In the Human condition of modern life the rule is
absolute, the race which does not value trained
intelligence is Doomed. . . ."
--Alfred North Whitehead

## Introductory Statement

Within the last few decades several attempts have been made to change the role of the university in today's post-industrialized society. Administrative policies have increasingly been attacked from within and without during recent years. Part of this interest has focused upon admissions requirements and policies of the several institutions and how these requirements might be changed or modified to offer opportunities for persons heretofore denied access to a higher education.

## Traditional Admissions Criteria Used By Colleges and Universities

Colleges and universities throughout America have traditionally defined their admissions criteria in the light of self-interest and usually employed a limited scope in describing the type and caliber of student each sought to attract. Some schools sought to develop and retain a measure of individuality with specific though restricted goals and aims for the institution, while many tended to take their clues from

Harvard University and a few other well known and established institutions.

For many years, each college had its own preferred method of admission which generally consisted of an entrance examination, oral, written, or both. Blackwell has suggested that with the organization of the College Entrance Examination Board in 1900, efforts toward uniformity in admission practices began.[1] Subsequent to World War II, colleges adopted tests which had been designed to identify individuals with superior aptitudes and capacities. Subsequently, these institutions employed a broader use of written tests as schools tended to depend upon test scores, grades and other limited criteria in their admissions policies. It is interesting to note that these policies had been designed mostly to increase the institutions' level of influence in the academic circles and to limit the number and kinds of students who gained admission to their schools.

In discussing how colleges differ, Everett C. Hughes over a decade ago had the following to say:

> At McGill University, when I began to teach about the time the young ladies from the upper-middle slopes of the Westmount section of Montreal stopped going to finishing school and started going to college, these same young ladies seemed to have as their goal a good, solid 'second-class' achieved by competent, unrestrained effort. 'First-class' would have indicated eager competitiveness worthy only of those 'pros' who were working for prizes and graduate scholarships; 'Third

---

[1] Thomas E. Blackwell, College and University Administration (New York: The Center for Applied Research in Education, Inc., 1966), p. 59.

> Class' would have betrayed either slackness or lack of ability to take things in one's stride. . . . We apparently have assumed that students have stronger individual goals than workingmen, and that the main thing required to raise levels of accomplishments is simply to raise standards required of individuals for entrance and graduation.[2]

Thus, the development of selected and/or restricted admissions policies tended to take more definite form during the decade of the fifties.

## Tests

The American Council on Education Test, developed by L. L. Thurston, was used for more than twenty-five years. The Educational Testing Service, sponsored jointly by the College Entrance Examination Board, the American Council on Education, and the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Education, developed the School and College Ability Tests (SCAT) to estimate a student's academic ability, and the Sequential Tests of Educational Progress (STEP), a series of educational achievement tests in seven major fields of learning from the fourth grade to the college sophomore level.

Tests sponsored by the National Merit Scholarship Competition since 1956 are given in over 17,500 high schools. The Measurement Research Center, Inc. was established in 1959 at the State University of Iowa to serve students not participating in national and regional screening programs. The State University of Iowa was also the site for the development of the American College Test (ACT) under the direction of E. F. Linquist.[3]

---

[2] Everett C. Hughes, "How Colleges Differ," Planning College Policy for the Critical Decade Ahead (Princeton, N.J.: College Entrance Examination Board, 1958), pp. 16-17.

Sam Webb researched the increased selectivity and institutional standards during the fifties and stated that:

> In anticipation of the day when active efforts to up-grade the equality of the student body could be undertaken, we administered to the enrolled students of the freshman class of 1951, the Scholastic Aptitude Test (SAT) of the College Entrance Examination Board. . . . Serious efforts toward up-grading the freshman class began with the entering class of 1957. All applicants for the class were required to submit scores on the SAT.[4]

As noted above, test scores and the use of various written entrance examinations became widespread during the decade of the fifties which were given in the interest of "up-grading" the quality of college freshmen.

## Grades

With the use of more written examinations came also the use of high school grades as a determinant to gaining entrance to college. Grades have also been used as a predictor of relative college success, which also is expressed in the level of grades earned, i.e., good grades in high school predict good grades in college. A "record of school grades" is used by all member colleges of the College Board who also make use of its tests in their admissions procedures.[5]

---

[3] Blackwell, op. cit., p. 60.

[4] Sam C. Webb, "Increased Selectivity and Institutional Standards," Research Related to College Admissions (Atlanta, Ga.: Southern Regional Education Board, 1963), p. 54

[5] The College Handbook (Princeton, N.J.: The College Entrance Examination Board, 1963), p. vii.

In his article, "Grades: A Barrier to College for the Disadvantaged," Ocania Chalk states that while fifty percent of all high school graduates go on to college, only eight percent of the nation's poor graduate from high school and move directly to college. Chalk also suggests that a significant number of disadvantaged students with "C" averages have high potential for learning and also that only fifty American colleges have compensatory educational programs for the disadvantaged student.[6] Chalk further suggests that almost all college scholarships go to the "traditional college type" or more affluent students.

## Other Traditional Criteria

Colleges and universities also use grades, reference letters, interviews, social, economic, ethnic and cultural factors together with other policies in their selection process. These are all designed to eliminate undesirables and include those desirables most likely to succeed. By 1953, Kenneth Young had discussed the limits placed on age, sex and race to gaining college education.[7] Dr. Lewis B. Ward (College Admissions No. 2, College Entrance Examination Board, 1955) reviews literature which indicates that interviews can predict performance relative to grades earned in college. By 1962, Frank Bowles added self-image and success-oriented factors which were largely shared by middle and upper class socio-economic America.[8] Concludingly, it was to be said, "the Colleges and Universities of New York are highly selective in their admissions policy in both theory and practice."[9]

---

[6] Ocania Chalk, "Grades: A Barrier to College for the Disadvantaged," Changing Education (Spring, 1970), pp. 11-13.

[7] Kenneth E. Young, "Who Can and Should Go to What Kind of College," Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation (Stanford, California: Stanford University, 1953), pp. 170-175.

## Summary

In summarizing traditional admissions criteria used by colleges and universities, it can be said that these policies and procedures have emanated from an ideology based upon social class, wealth, and the ideas of James B. Conant, who espoused in 1949 "those who obtain a professional education should be chosen on the basis of pure Merit,"[10] and Merit as defined by Dr. Conant is determined on the basis of intellectual ability.

## Success and Failures with Traditional Admissions Criteria

The use of traditional admissions criteria to colleges and universities has met with empirical success and failures. These relative measures of extremities are evident throughout our society. One can easily point to successes with pride through out nation's efforts and accomplishments in the areas of business, indistrial, technical and mechanical progress which provides America with all the leisures and comforts of an affluent society. It is not, however, the primary purpose of this paper to point up success, but failures; higher education's failure to provide adequate training and development of significant numbers of its citizens identified as ethnic or racial minorities.

---

[8] Frank H. Bowles, "Intangibles in Admissions Planning," CEEB (1958), pp. 22-26.

[9] David S. Beskowitz, Inequality of Opportunity in Higher Education (New York: State Department of Education, 1948), p. 38.

[10] James B. Conant, Education in a Divided World (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1949), p. 163.

## Successes

As implied earlier, the success of traditional admissions standards can be noted in the quality of students secured and their relative contributions to our great nation. As former President John F. Kennedy (1963) once suggested, "ask not what America can do for you, but ask, what can I do for America?" To do this, one must have an opportunity to serve without restrictions; those students who represent the middle and upper socio-economic stratas of our society have been accorded a full opportunity to develop their potential and thus "serve our country well." Hutchins (1948), Young (1953), and many others have researched and documented evidence that persons with sufficient affluence do not suffer from the lack of opportunity to attend a public institution of higher learning. Patricia Sex (Education and Income, 1963), and others have documented the affluenciality of earning a college education. Those students whose parents attended college have largely been successful in earning advanced education themselves. A disproportionate number of ethnic minorities have consistently been denied equal access to higher education; however, a small percentage have persistently been successful with traditional major college admissions policies.

## Failures

Failures in the traditional college selecting process were cited by President Truman's Commission in 1947 which recommended "a more flexible set of criteria for selection of students"[11] and then continued by pointing out some specific kinds of ability that higher education should serve:

> We shall be denying educational opportunity to many young people as long as we maintain the present orientation of higher education toward verbal skills and intellectual interests. Many young people have abilities of a different kind, and they cannot receive 'education commensurate with their native capacities' in colleges and universities that recognize only one kind of educable intelligence.[12]

The New York Commission estimated in 1946 that 513,000 blacks resided in that state. Of this number, it was estimated that 35,000 youths, aged 18 to 21, were state residents, of which 1,484 or 4.2 percent of the age group attended college in the state.[13] Black students attending college in the state of New York comprised slightly more than one percent in 1946, with more than one-half of the black students attending college outside the state.[14] Almost all of those blacks attending college outside New York were believed to be enrolled in

---

[11] George F. Zook, et al., Higher Education for American Democracy. Report of the President's Commission on Higher Education. Vol. 2, "Equalizing and Expanding Individual Opportunity" (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1947), p. 41.

[12] Ibid.

[13] Beskowitz, op. cit., p. 135.

[14] Ibid., pp. 142, 164.

Southern, predominantly Black, schools.

> The most direct proof of restrictive practices [the Commission asserted] is an acknowledgment of the respective institutions that such policies exist.[15]

The Commission also noted that more than one-third of the Black New York youngsters were from Southern backgrounds, which this writer suspects was a result of "heading north for a better opportunity." The riots of the mid-sixties testify only partially to the "nightmare" reality of the "dreams" of Blacks.

A study of discrimination in college admissions by the American Council on Education showed for 1947 that:

> . . . the 10,063 young people may be taken as a highly reliable cross section of all white high school seniors,[16] [and one major result was that] roughly a third of the white students in the high school class of 1947 applied to college that fall, and that 30% of all such seniors were accepted . . . while negro boys and girls who go to high school usually apply to college in substantially higher proportions than above, the negro undergraduate enrollment in the nation's institutions of higher learning amounted, in 1947, to not more than 3% of the whole.[17]

This research also showed (p. 55) that the three top categories of successful applicants were:

1. Children of men who had more than a B.A. education, 96 percent success.

2. Seniors rated in the first academic quarter, 92 percent

---

[15] Ibid., p. 92.

[16] Helen Edna Davis, On Getting Into College: A Study of Discrimination in College Admissions (Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1949), p. 6.

[17] Ibid., p. 79.

success.

3. Children of professional men and executives, 92 percent success.

> Blacks represented just over 10 percent of the total population of the United States in 1948. Yet enrollment of Blacks in institutions of higher education during the school year 1947 accounted for only 3.1 percent of the total. An approximated 75,000 students of Black descent were enrolled: of these approximately 85 percent were enrolled in 105 segregated institutions.[18]

The problem of opportunity for ethnic minorities, especially Blacks, to earn a higher education has continued to be impaired. The denial of equal access to higher learning constitutes a serious infringement of the civil rights of such individuals, and severely handicaps their ability to heed former United States President John F. Kennedy's edification--to do the most you can for your country.

Twenty years after President Truman's Commission on Higher Education (1948) listed other barriers to college attendance including money, race, religion, sex, geography, ability and mobility, Jencks (1968) adds to this list. Jencks' four factors (money, geography, race, and environment) are closely related to the commission's report and others. These factors all almost exclusively tend to deny ethnic minorities and particularly Blacks an equal opportunity for college education. The important point to realize here is that these factors are all tied closely to the social-economic cultural factor which provides upper and middle class students the facility with which to follow through on plans to prepare for and enter college. Often, because of geographic and environmental factors, an affluent student who has no interest in college may decide to attend during the last portion of his Senior year in high school or after graduation and immediately gain entrance to a four year institution of post-secondary education. Blacks, and other lower social-economic classes, can ill afford such luxury. These individuals lack needed reinforcement for education in their immediate environment.

---

[18] The Truman Commission Report (1948), p. 110.

In his book, Colleges Today and Tomorrow, Lewis B. Mayhew cites court decisions, civil rights legislation, protests and other efforts to gain greater opportunities for Blacks to earn a higher education. He states that "as late as 1965, colleges across the country were beginning to talk about the possibility of trying to do something, at some time in the future, about the college education of American Negroes."[19] Mr. Mayhew also suggested that in 1967 the picture had not changed, and that only after the death of Dr. Martin Luther King were colleges and universities forced to seriously consider their stand and to seek ways of extending educational opportunities to Blacks.

In an earlier article entitled "Faith and Despair," Lewis B. Mayhew stated that only a few places, including the University of California, Berkeley, have exerted honest efforts to increase the proportion of Black students. Regardless of the cost, most institutions, according to Mr. Mayhew, have done nothing. He also suggests that graduate schools will accept all qualified Black students, but will do nothing to modify their admissions policies to enable Black students to become qualified.

---

[19] Lewis B. Mayhew, Colleges Today and Tomorrow (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Company, 1969), p. 91.

Mr. Mayhew continued by saying that Junior Colleges would not reject Black students but will move to locations which, by sheer fact of distance, deny these students from the ghetto. (This factor became a reality recently--in 1971--in Oakland, California where Merritt College, which served a highly populated Black community, was moved to the hills. Students protested, many cried, demonstrated, and attempted to close the school for several months, but to no avail. Merritt College moved to the hills, away from the common folk.) Mr. Mayhew also insists that selective four year colleges desire more Black students but use their scholarship resources for students whom they think have the greater chance of survival--that is, white Anglo-Saxon children of middle-class intellectual homes. Mr. Mayhew concludes this article by suggesting that institutions of higher learning: 1) Make available more financing for Black students by offering massive scholarships; 2) Expand capacities to handle 200,000 to one million more students; 3) Institutions commit themselves to a policy of 12 percent Black students without respect to formal admissions; 4) College Presidents urge their service and social groups to extend invitations to leaders of the Black community without respect to whether leadership was professional.

As gross inequalities continue to persist, it can be noted that various categories of ethnic minority groups and lower social-economic groups bear the brunt of an uneven distribution of educational resources. One example is a two percent enrollment of Black students in 80 major state universities in the United States.[20] The 1963-65 issue of Guide to the Use of American College Testing Program Services, cites the utilization of grades to predict college success. However, it should be recognized that good grades are not the only indication of a successful college experience.

Dorothy Knoell recently had the following to say about gaining admission:

> The problem is often less one of qualification and cost than of conformity and adherence to certain behavior patterns which middle class youths and their parents find more facile than does the lower class. The problem is less one of achieving certain test scores than of arranging to take the test on a particular date (and pay a fee to do so): Less a matter of achieving a certain record in high school than of persisting to graduation and submitting a transcript to prove it; less a problem of health than of getting to a physician for an examination on a certain day.[21]

The factor of when and under what conditions to take specific tests constitutes the rigid bureaucratic procedures which operate against disadvantaged youths. One example of this factor was a case involving Isaac Curtis, a Black student athlete at the University of California, Berkeley (1971-1972) who, because of alleged failure to take an entrance examination on an appointed date and time, resulted in the university's suspension from credit in certain competitive sports. During 1972, Mr. Curtis was seeking education at San Diego State College. "Isaac Curtis and Larry Burnsey were ruled scholastically ineligible to compete in Athletics because, through no fault of their own, Cal did not give them the 'academic predictability' test at the right time."[22] Since the oversight was the university's fault, the university decided not to penalize the two players; both were allowed to compete in sports. The NCAA prohibited the university from ever winning their conference titles while these players were active. By Spring, 1972, these players were no longer active participants, and the courts had restored the university to full competitive status for athletic events.

---

[20] John Egerton, "Almost All White," Southern Education Report, IV, 9 (May, 1969), 2-17. (Also see John Egerton, State Universities and Black Americans [Atlanta, Ga.: Southern Education Reporting Service, May, 1969].)

[21] Dorothy M. Knoell, "Are Our Colleges Really Accessible to the Poor?" Junior College Journal, Vol. 39, No. 2 (October, 1968), 9.

A statewide seminar on Race and Poverty was held in California during 1968 which resulted in the seminar recommending two specifics: 1) "Tests should be ignored or discarded in favor of intuitive judgments and intensive counseling . . .," and 2) "Minority/poverty students should be allowed one year to adjust to the campus, and there should be no dismissal until the third semester or fifth quarter."[23] The following year, the National Association of College Admissions Counselors met and passed resolutions designed to "eliminate the use of aptitude test scores as a major factor in determining eligibility for admission for minority students" and to "assure minority students at least two years in which to adjust to the university environment."[24]

---

[22] San Jose Mercury, "Curtis Unsure of Move." (San Jose, Ca.: January 27, 1972.)

[23] Benjamin W. McKendall, Jr., Statewide Seminar on Race and Poverty (Palo Alto, Ca.: College Entrance Examination Board, 1968), pp. 18-19.

The New York Times of September 27, 1970, quoted the Scranton Report (Reports of the President's Commission on campus unrest) as follows:

> Campus protest has been focused on three major questions: war, racial injustice and the University itself. The first issue is the unfulfilled promise of full justice and dignity for Blacks and other minorities. Blacks, like many others of different races and ethnic origin, are demanding today that the pledges of the Declaration of Independence and the Emancipation Proclamation be fulfilled now. Full social justice and dignity--an end to racism, in all its human, social and cultural forms--is a central demand of today's students, Black, Brown, and White.

Clearly, the failures of traditional forms used to admit students to college have failed consistently a large portion of our citizenry as recent population figures for the San Francisco Bay Area revealed the following population statistics:

A. San Francisco City - approximately 26 percent Black.

B. East Bay, including Oakland and Berkeley - approximately 34 percent Blacks.

C. San Jose area - approximately five percent Blacks.

The estimated percentages of Blacks enrolled in public four-year colleges located in these areas were:

---

[24] National Scholarship Service and Fund for Negro Students, "NACAC Passes Revised CCA Resolutions," NSSFN News (December, 1969), p. 4.

1. San Francisco, approximately five percent.
2. Oakland - Berkeley, approximately three percent.
3. San Jose area, approximately three percent.

This subject is discussed further in a section entitled "Ethnic and Racial Characteristics of Students and Graduates," this paper.

### Summary

In summarizing this section on the successes and failures of traditional admissions criteria, it can be stated that, clearly, the highest proportions of success have been with white, middle and upper class social-economic students. Lower social-economic students and particularly ethnic and racial minorities have suffered tremendously in our society through lack of equality of educational opportunity. However, particularly acute problems of who should decide "who decides?" and "who should go to college?" continue to be debated in circles permeating our civil ranks from street people to political circles and the academic arena.

## Particularly Difficult Problems

It is not always easy to say "who should decide" who goes to college or "who should go to college?" Perhaps the one thing which most Americans today would agree on is that the day when only the "rich or privileged few" should attend college is over. However, once this gross generalization is made, the areas of specifics promote lengthy debate which has continued to the present.

## Who Should Decide, "Who Should Decide?"

Samuel Bowles in his article, "Toward Equality of Educational Opportunity," identified three major questions with respect to equality of opportunity. These were:

A. What should school policies be?

B. Who should decide what the policies should be?

C. How should the decisions be made?

While Mr. Bowles was addressing the question with regard to compulsory education in our country, these same concerns are relevant to higher education. The turmoil surrounding college admissions policies and procedures renders keen urgency to relate Bowles' questions to admissions policies.

In response to the question as to "Who should decide who goes to college?" former Senator Wayne Morse, in a recent article so titled, stated that the people should decide. His conclusions were reached after reviewing the historic role of education in our society and the centrality of the concept of equal opportunity in our value system. Mr. Morse sees the prime purpose of our educational system as preparing students for employment and thinks that it is the responsibility of society to educate our citizenry through post-secondary schooling in our highly technological system. Mr. Morse advocates an open admissions policy.

Stephen Y. Tonsor in his recent article, "Who Should Decide Who Goes to College?" concluded the student should decide. He also feels that an adequate financial aid system is the major vehicle determining freedom of choice. He suggests that "Making grants to student . . . and such grants being a citizen's right," would end in failure. Mr. Tonsor intimates that open opportunity for all Americans for post-secondary education would lead to a continuation of inferior educational training for minority and lower socio-economic groups. Mr. Tonsor would leave the admissions requirements in the hands of institutions.

Dr. Kenneth E. Young, former President of Cortland College of the State University of New York and currently with the American College Testing Program, suggested recently that the priority needs of higher education was a re-definition of "higher education" and that consideration must be given to the issues before deciding "who should decide" who should go to college.[25]

The notion and assumption that academicians (Sidney Hooks, James B. Conant and others) should decide who goes to college should be either re-examined or disregarded, suggest Ferrin (1970), Willingham (1969), and others.

## Who Should Go To College

James B. Conant suggests that "the highly talented" should attend college. He states in 1949:

> We should plan to recruit a vastly superior group of young men and women in the professions by a scholarship policy but we might well proceed at the start by taking a few professions at a time and aiming at high quality rather than numbers.[26]

---

[25] Philip Rever (ed.), Open Admissions and Equal Access (Iowa City, Iowa: The American College Testing Program, 1971), p. 8.

[26] Conant, op. cit., p. 63.

Dr. Conant continued by saying that the four-year college of the university type was the first step in the professional journey which has served to provide a pathway for white-collar jobs in business and industry but that these institutions should concentrate on feeding the university professional schools. On the intellectual factor Robert Hutchins had this to say:

> Those students who have demonstrated--that they have the intellectual qualifications for advanced work should be permitted to go on to the university, which I think of as beginning at about the present Junior year. Those students who have not distinguished themselves or who do not wish to go on should be encouraged to betake themselves to practical life.[27]

In 1948, President Truman's Commission on Higher Education concluded that 50 percent of the college-age population could profit from two years of post-secondary schooling. The Commission also stated that 32 percent of the college-age population could benefit from a four-year college or baccalaureate degree programs.

The Commission further stated that discrimination in the admission of college students because of an individual's race, color, sex, creed or national origin or ancestry is an anti-democratic practice which creates serious inequalities in the opportunity for higher education. The Commission was opposed to discrimination and believed it should be abandoned.[28] The Commission stated also that no parade of statistics was required to know that the situation for young people of minority groups is today unsatisfactory, both in their opportunity to enter college and in the happiness of their college life.[29] The Commission urged educational institutions of higher learning to act as pioneering agents of leadership against discrimination and recommended that they plan and prosecute a well organized program to reduce and, where possible, promptly eliminate discrimination, not only by correcting its policies and practices, but also by educating its students to seek the abolition of discriminatory practices in all their manifestations.

---

[27] Robert M. Hutchins, Education for Freedom (Baton Rouge, La.: State University Press, 1943), pp. 60-61.

[28] Higher Education for American Democracy, A Report of the President's Commission on Higher Education (Washington, D.C.: December, 1947), p. 25.

In 1952, B. S. Hollinshead in his book, Who Should Go to College, concluded that the top twenty-five percent of the college-age youth in academic ability should pursue the baccalaureate degree. In his book, The Smaller Liberal Arts College, Lewis B. Mayhew suggested that with some outstanding exceptions, private liberal arts colleges state that they admit students who graduated in the upper half of their classes and have good character.[30] He intimates that, in practice, any students from any rank of their high school graduating class can gain admittance into any of a number of liberal arts colleges. Mr. Mayhew says further that even those who have not graduated from high school can also gain admittance by demonstrating minimal performance on such tests as those of General Education Development.

---

[29] Ibid., p. 26.

[30] Lewis B. Mayhew, The Smaller Liberal Arts College (Washington, D.C.: The Center for Applied Research in Education, Inc., 1962), pp. 56-57.

In an article, A Master Plan for Higher Education in California, 1960-1975, prepared by the Master Plan survey team in 1960, the committee recommended that Junior Colleges, State Colleges and Universities make statistical studies of their entrance requirements and report annually on validity judged by scholarship, persistence, rate of dismissal, and scores on standard tests. The Master Plan also recommended that the university accept the top 12 percent and the State colleges the top 33 percent of the state high school graduating classes.

William M. Birenbaum, President of Staten Island Community College, in his 1970 article titled "Who Should Go to College?" accused higher education of flourishing as a vital, credential-dispensing entity primarily serving the middle class and bestowing such credentials only upon those who conform to the self-estimates of this middle class. Dr. Birenbaum challenged these assumptions and concluded that much of this employment has resulted in considerable failure. Provost Robert S. Babcock agreed with Dr. Birenbaum in his recent article so titled, and argued that an opportunity to earn the baccalaureate degree should be available to all students. Old forms of admissions practices and concepts of higher education are fading into the past, suggested Timothy S. Healy in his 1971 article, "Commentary: Who Should Attend College?" President of Johns Hopkins University, Dr. Lincoln Gordon, during an address given recently at the University of Hawaii, discussed universal opportunity, restless students, false credentialism, and college entrance before concluding that "perhaps everybody should not go to college," the title of his speech. Mr. Gordon does suggest, however, that there should be no hindrance to the senior college admission of qualified community college graduates who have spent some interval in a full-time job. The American College Testing Program 1971, Monograph Four, titled Open Admissions and Equal Access, edited by Philip Rever, concluded with the statement on page 36 that "We have finally answered the question, Who Should Go to College?" The answer is: "We are no longer prepared to tell anyone that he should not try to go."

## Comparison and Reconciliation of Opinions

Conant and Hutchins tend to emphasize the intellectual and high ability factor with the latter using qualifying statements relative to preparation. Dr. Conant's traditional criteria would eliminate perhaps sixty percent or more students from enrollment in higher education. To be sure, there should be space at the university for both the rich student as well as the "highly talented."

Hollinshead in 1952 seemed to address the needs of America during the rising space age when some modifying concepts of James B. Conant were being practiced. His suggestion that 25 percent of the top talented students should go to college is considerably different from what Mr. Mayhew observed to be true one decade later. It appears that Dr. Mayhew is suggesting two things: 1) that the loud noise raised about restricted admissions policies was not totally valid with many institutions, and 2) that the (Liberal Arts) colleges advertise for one type of student but in practice will take on "all comers." Mr. Mayhew also seems to be suggesting that there is a place for all prospective college students somewhere within the walls of the less selective institutions.

As indicated earlier, the question "who should decide?" is not an easy one. Mr. Tonsor, in leaving the matter entirely up to the university officials, suggests a continuing isolated arena of academic snobbery, while Senator Morse's suggestion that the "people" should decide cannot be accepted without some qualification either. Students, as mentioned by Senator Morse, should have a say in determining who goes to college, but should they have the final say? I would suggest probably not. Also, I would question whether academicians, voters, or any one particular segment of society should hold the exclusive right to make the determination. Each individual student should have the right to decide for himself.

Birenbaum, Healy, and Babcock see the waning away of traditional admissions criteria and generally agree that this is a positive direction for higher education to move. Dr. Gordon, however, recognizes the great purpose and efforts of community colleges, and would caution against open admissions to senior colleges and universities. I think students should reserve the right to succeed or fail in college, whether community or senior, and this can best be determined only after those interested in such pursuance have matriculated.

## Summary

In summarizing this section it appears quite evident that Daniel P. Moynihan's statement "on Universal Higher Education" seems appropriate.

> Higher education in America, for all its size, remains a privilege. It is to some extent a generational privilege, separating old from young. But, it is also a privilege among the young. Half get it. Half do not. Of those who do, far the most attractive

> arrangements are made for the children of the well-to-do, and for another, not less lucky, group of persons who happen to be very smart. Of those who do not, the disadvantage is all the greater because they are so conspicuously excluded.[31]

Moynihan suggests also that the elite minority characteristic of higher education is likely to continue. However, emerging concepts of expanded educational opportunities have drawn more and more attention since the close of World War II.

## Emerging Concepts of Expanded Educational Opportunity

In keeping with the ideals and concepts of equality for all in the American traditional philosophy of life, the Truman Report of 1948 was perhaps one of the first significant efforts to expand opportunity in higher education. This concept of expansion was focused on higher education, which had basically been reserved for the affluent and "highly gifted" before World War II.

In light of the Commission's report, scholars began to review their stance on "who should attend college," and many began to expand earlier positions. For example, James B. Conant, highly committed to "a superior intelligent student" on the college campus, was to suggest by 1950 that higher education should guide each student according to ability and taste. Note here that "taste" is added which, when considered out of context, does not appear to be very important. However, when considered together with other unfolding concepts, this begins to formalize a much more liberal interpretation of educational opportunity.

---

[31] Daniel P. Moynihan, "On Universal Higher Education," in Charles G. Dobbins (ed.), Educational Record, Vol. 52, No. 1 (Washington, D.C.: Winter, 1971), p. 10.

By 1957, the President's Commission on Education Beyond High School recommended promoting the aptitudes and abilities of the individual to best serve both the person and the nation. The Commission cited increased demands of a modern civilization, for effective citizenship, the growing complexities of industrial and business expansion, and concluded that greater accessibility of educational opportunity will be needed to meet these expectations. This opportunity should be expanded without respect to race, color, creed or national origin.[32]

A similar Commission three years later considered the importance of individual choice and dignity with:

> The status of the individual must remain our primary concern. All our institutions--political, social, and economic--must further enhance the dignity of the citizen, stimulate their responsible exercise, and widen the range and effectiveness of opportunities for individual choice.[33]

By this time it seemed clear that the federal government was becoming increasingly more interested in education, and debates were widespread throughout our country about the limits and role it should play.

A few short years elapsed before John R. Hills wrote "Assessing

---

[32] The President's Committee on Education Beyond High School, Second Report to the President (Washington, D.C.: USGPO, July, 1957), p. ix.

[33] The President's Committee on National Goals, Goals for Americans (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice Hall, Inc., 1960), p. 3.

Academic Potential," during which he took up the argument of releasing some traditional criteria. His discussion of equality of opportunity led to what scholars referred to as a "compromised position" between open opportunity for all to higher education and education for the minority elite. Hills summarized his research with:

> There is nothing unfair about a college being selective in its admissions of students. However, the selection should be according to carefully developed and implemented goals. The goals should be chosen for academic and educational reasons rather than economic or personal reasons. The selection should be based on academic promise.[34]

Mr. Hills suggested that the use of grades, test scores, together with other criteria, could be useful in predicting college success, but he thinks that the interview is the most flagrant in its widespread use and uselessness for assessment.

By 1964, the Education Policies Commission addressed the concept of a free man. Recognizing that our society is based upon the principle that all its citizens are free, they expanded the concept. A free man, according to the Commission, is one who:

> . . . is capable of basing his choices and actions on understanding which he himself achieves and on values which he embraces for himself. He is aware of the bases on which he accepts propositions as true. He understands the value by which he lives, the assumptions on which they rest, and the consequences to which they lead. He recognizes that others have different values.[35]

---

[34] John R. Hills, "Assessing Academic Potential," in Kenneth Wilson, (ed.), Research Related to College Admissions (Atlanta, Ga.: Southern Regional Education Board, 1963), p. 86.

[35] Educational Policies Commission, Universal Opportunities for Education Beyond High School (Washington, D.C.: National Educatio. Association, 1964), p. 1.

Lewis B. Mayhew, Professor of Higher Education at Stanford University, states in Higher Education in the Revolutionary Decade that education, including higher education, must no longer remain only a privilege for the upper and middle classes since one primary device by which an open society can be maintained is through greater accessibility for all Americans to earn a college degree.

If one buys the argument that ethnic minorities learn more in integrated school situations, it is reasonable to suggest that complete integration of our nation's high schools plays an important part in expanding educational opportunities. This factor is particularly significant in our twelve-to-fifteen largest cities which house the greater proportion of ethnic minorities.

The National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges suggested in 1969 that higher education should be available to all who could benefit from such an experience, with special programs being provided for the disadvantaged. This concept of disadvantaged does not apply to all ethnic minority persons, as a small percentage have persisted in being successful college students by traditional concepts and criteria.

By 1970, the concept of equal educational opportunity for all citizens to "past secondary education is a right, not a privilege,"[36] was suggested by Warren Willingham.

---

[36] Warren W. Willingham, Free Access--Higher Education (New York: College Entrance Examination Board, 1970), p. 5.

## Summary

In summarizing this section one can easily observe that the federal government began to take the lead in expanding concepts of educational opportunity with the Truman Report in 1948. Also, as can be noted, federal commissions have continued to expand these concepts. The private sector has been somewhat slower to respond to these concepts but academicians have taken up the argument speaking for and against equal access to higher education. Efforts to make these extending concepts a reality have been made, and it is to this discussion that I now turn.

## Recent Efforts to Provide Equal Educational Opportunity

As was seen earlier, the President's Commission in 1948 charged institutions of higher learning with the responsibility of making rigorous efforts to plan and prosecute well-organized programs to reduce and, where possible, promptly eliminate discrimination based upon race, color or national origin. While these planned programs have been slow in coming, some nonetheless have emerged during the last five to seven years.

Efforts have been extended by institutions together with state and federal governments, and foundations have been laid to eliminate some of the barriers to higher education.

### Institutional Efforts

In unpublished reports compiled by the College Entrance Examination Board in Palo Alto, California, in 1971, twelve institutions of higher education were listed as having significant programs or projects for ethnic minorities.

A summary of these efforts shows the following:

1. Most began in 1968 or after.
2. Earliest program began in 1966.
3. Each project enrolled from 35 to 400 students yearly.
4. Some programs were aimed at cross-cultural developments.
5. All provided tutorial, financial aid and counseling to its students.

Stanford University began an experiment in special admissions by attraching minority students to its undergraduate ranks in 1968. These students were mostly Blacks and Mexican Americans. A report was made on the project in 1970 which indicated that a very successful experiment had taken place. While these "Special Admits" did not meet Stanford's traditional requirements, the results can be summarized with Frank Newman's statement that "Different criteria have clearly been used for admissions of some minorities, but there is little or no evidence of any change in degree standards. The career performance of Blacks seems roughly comparable to that of other students."[37] Following this report, Stanford disbanded the Special Admissions Program, but expanded its General Admissions Policies to include a wider range of criteria for selecting students.

---

[37] Frank Newman, Report on Higher Education (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, U.S. Government Printing Office, 1971), p. 45.

The City University of New York began Open Admissions in 1970, enrolling several thousand ethnic minority students who did not meet traditional admissions criteria. This Open Admissions policy resulted in Blacks and Puerto Ricans making up approximately 25 percent of the total freshman class as reported by M. A. Faber in the New York Times of March 16, 1971. Faber also suggested that this proportion was roughly the same proportion of Blacks and Puerto Ricans in the city's high school graduating classes of 1970. Seymour C. Hyman, CUNY Deputy Chancellor, claimed that guaranteed college admission motivates students to complete their high school education. In support of their positive position on CUNY's policy, Hyman reported on a study of 1970 freshmen which showed that ethnic minorities took better advantage of CUNY's Open Admissions than did whites.[38]

The Ford Foundation has announced a six-year, $100 million program to increase minority opportunities in higher education. Between 70 and 80 percent of the Foundation's total assistance for the general improvement of American higher education for the next six years will be devoted to minority opportunities.[39] The Ford Foundation also granted financial aid to Howard and Atlanta Universities. These two universities were the only predominantly Black schools among 250 American institutions of higher learning offering the doctorate degree.

## State Governments

The state college and university systems, together with Junior and community colleges are designed to serve the citizens of their respective states and, more specifically, in their given areas of residence. To date, a disproportionately high percentage of Blacks and lower socio-economic individuals are continually denied access to higher education. One report, The Cost of Education in California, 1960-1975, prepared by the technical committee on costs of higher education in California, suggested that higher education in the state of California was then readily available to the vast majority of California high school graduates, that any high school graduate may be admitted to Junior College, and that at least 75 percent of such graduates live within the Junior College district. The report suggested further that all public institutions of higher learning in the state including the state colleges and the university system were regional and primarily served the local population. This is what some would suggest as California's answer to equal educational opportunity.

---

[38] "Open Admissions: Good or Bad?" Phi Delta Kappan (January, 1972), p. 338.

[39] Ibid., p. 339.

## Open Admissions

This non-restrictive policy has prompted considerable debate. A look at statewide plans for equalizing educational opportunities in higher education shows that New York and North Dakota use open admissions.

> Open admissions are destroying the effectiveness of colleges and universities. No student should be barred from a college education by the lack of money, and the needs of the unprepared, underachieving, the late-blooming youth should be met by extra preparation. This preparation, however,

should go on outside of the university.[40]

In an article entitled "Open Admissions Before the Deluge," Theodore M. Newcomb (1971) reminds us that initial understanding is important in developing admissions policies. The understanding that some sort of implicit contract between student and institution is necessary is recognized. Peter Schrag, editor of Change magazine, raised the question "Open Admissions to What?" in an article so titled. He questioned: Just what is the college doing? What kind of experiences are being provided for students? One conclusion was that alternatives to going to college should be established for youngsters.

ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education in Washington, D.C., in late 1971 published a bibliographical critique of publications related to Open Admissions. Leo A. Monday and Philip Rever note that Open Admissions suggest the absence of any standard of academic performance in the process of determining the admissibility of a prospective student in the eligibility decision.[41] Etzioni (1969) proposed a universal plan for two years post-secondary education and selective admission the final two years. The Carnegie Commission on Higher Education (1970) used the term "Universal Access" in describing their recommendations for equal opportunity in higher education. One proposal made by the Commission was that "each state plan to provide universal access to its total system, but not necessarily to each of its institutions, since they vary greatly in their nature and purpose."[42] The Commission also cited New York and Washington, D.C., California and Hawaii as examples of public systems of higher education that are providing or will provide universal access to higher education. While all applicants would be eligible for entry into the state system, admissions would focus on placement of students in the appropriate institutions within the system, and in some cases in the courses and curriculum within the institution, that correspond to the student's achievement, plans, skills, and needs.

---

[40] Spiro T. Agnew, "Toward a 'Middle Way' in College Admissions," Educational Record (Spring, 1970), pp. 106-111.

[41] Rever, op. cit., p. 90.

## Federal Government

The Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963 provides institutions (section 104) with grants for the construction of academic facilities to meet urgent needs for student enrollment expansion.

The Higher Education Act of 1965 was designed to assist colleges and universities in strengthening their development (Title III) and educational opportunity grants for students (Title IV). Institutions of higher learning can utilize these provisions to help expand their scope both in number of students admitted and range of courses offered. Title I of the 1968 Higher Education Act provided added student assistance (Educational Opportunity Grants, Government Insured Student Loans,

---

[42] Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, A Chance To Learn: An Action Agenda for Equal Opportunity in Higher Education (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1970), p. 13.

College Work-Study programs, Cooperative Education, and "forgiveness" clause of the National Defense Student Loan Program). These provisions allow for much needed financial aid for prospective students with a paucity of pecuniary means.

Other more specific federal involvement designed to remove barriers facing Mexican-Americans in California have included an OEO grant to provide special tutoring, counseling, and scholarship for college-oriented youths in inner-city schools. Deganawidth-Quetzalcoatl (D-Q) University in Davis, California is a thriving new institution operated by Mexican-Americans and American Indians. While the enrollment of sixty students during the school year 1971-1972 is small, the Office of Economic Opportunity has provided special funds to assist in the development of the university.[43]

The Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA) is currently encouraging Indian and Eskimo students to seek a college education through available federal aid which it offers via scholarships, grants and loans. The United States Office of Education and BIA recently reached a formal agreement (the first of its kind) which will give Indian parents a greater involvement in planning, development and operation of Title I (1965) programs by requiring the Bureau of Indian Affairs to establish parent councils.

---

[43] "A Unique University," Phi Delta Kappan (January, 1972), p. 339.

## Summary

In summarizing efforts made to provide equality of educational opportunities, it should be noted that several institutions and some states have taken significant steps to eliminate existing barriers. The federal government has also continually been involved, but the total effort is only marginal and needs strengthening.

## General Research on Colleges and Institutions

Some attempts have been made to study the effectiveness of individual and collective efforts. In a recent article, "The Importance of Black Colleges," Clayton Johnson made the following statement with reference to 80 predominantly white state universities and land grant colleges:

A. Less than two percent of their enrollment were Blacks; 1.93 percent of undergraduates and 1.91 percent of graduate students.

B. One major state university had 413 Blacks enrolled but only four received degrees in 1969.

C. Almost one-half of Black undergraduates were freshmen, while only 30 percent of all undergraduates were freshmen.

D. Only seven percent of undergraduates and 1.2 percent of graduates were awarded degrees during the 1967-1968 college year from these 80 institutions.

E. Less than one percent, or 600 out of 100,000 faculty members were Black.

Mr. Johnson's argument was in support of continuing the predominantly Black colleges, and he cited court cases outlawing segregation and discrimination in admissions policies but also the continued snail-like pace of integration in state colleges and universities.[44]

Edmond W. Gordon and Doxey A. Wilkerson noted in 1966 that minority enrollment of some non-black colleges had been increasing somewhat through the early and mid-sixties, but that the numbers and proportions generally remained small. They noted that eight Ivy League and seven sister colleges admitted 468 black men and women to their freshman classes in the fall of 1965. This was more than double the number admitted in the previous fall, and about three percent of total admissions.[45] Fred Crossland (1971) suggests that this effort surpassed that of most non-black higher education institutions at that time despite the group's highly selective admissions criteria. Gordon and Wilkerson also suggested that reduced course loads were prescribed for some students, and felt that this adjustment was both normal and reasonable. They also cited the need to evaluate such compensatory programs with much greater regularity.

By 1968, some colleges and universities began new approaches including visiting Black ghettoes, various high schools and developing Special Admissions programs. A survey of 129 public and private senior colleges in the Midwest revealed that minority freshman enrollment in creased 25 percent in 1969 over the previous year and an additional 30 percent in 1970. Willingham (1970) noted also that the 1968 minority freshmen represented 3.7 percent of the combined 129 freshman classes, 4.5 in 1969, and 5.6 percent in 1970.

---

[44] Clayton O. Johnson, "The Importance of Black Colleges," Educational Record, Vol. 52, No. 2 (Spring, 1971), p. 181.

[45] Edmond W. Gordon and Doxey A. Wilkerson, Compensatory Education for the Disadvantaged (New York: College Entrance Examination Board, 1966), p. 136.

Crossland (1971) also suggests that the Ford Foundation made 55 grants between May, 1968 and July, 1970, in support of a variety of efforts to lower the barriers to higher education. Twenty-five of these grants went to individual institutions to help initiate programs of recruitment and special handling of Black Americans, Mexican-Americans, Puerto Ricans and American Indians. In addition to these 25 colleges, the Ford Foundation made hundreds of additional grants relating to educational and other problems of minorities.

## Black NASULGC Enrollments

Continuing progress is reported in enrolling black students in universities holding membership in the National Association of State Universities and Land Grant Colleges. In 1968 only two member institutions reported Black enrollment of five percent or better. In 1969 that figure had increased to six percent, and in 1970 to twelve percent, headed by Wayne State University with 16.9 percent, City University of New York with 10.7 percent, and Rutgers University with 8.6 percent.[46]

## Minorities Grow in College

Members of minority groups constitute almost ten percent of the total undergraduate enrollment at the nation's state universities and land grant colleges, according to a recent survey. Reports from 103 major public universities throughout the country showed 132,545 minority students in a total enrollment of 1,352,366 in the fall of 1970. An additional 22,869 minority students enrolled in graduate schools made up 7.4 percent of the total graduate enrollment.

---

[46] Phi Delta Kappan, op. cit., p. 338.

A number of land grant institutions reported that they now conduct vigorous recruitment campaigns aimed at the disadvantaged minority study, and 63 universities noted that they have comprehensive special programs to help these students succeed once they are enrolled.

The composition of the minority student population in the study mentioned above was as follows:

| | Undergraduates (103 Institutions) | | Graduates (96 Institutions) | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| American Indian | 5,778 | (0.4%) | 788 | (0.3%) |
| American Negro | 80,427 | (5.9%) | 12,192 | (4.0%) |
| Oriental | 24,741 | (1.8%) | 6,294 | (2.0%) |
| Spanish Surnamed | 19,124 | (1.4%) | 3,015 | (1.0%) |
| Other | 2,475 | (0.2%) | 580 | (0.2%) |
| Total | 132,545 | (9.8%) | 22,869 | (7.4%) |

(Source: Phi Delta Kappan (January, 1972), p. 338.

The office of Civil Rights, USOE, has released figures for minority enrollments in all U.S. colleges in 1970, indicating that 379,000 students--about 6.5 percent of all students enrolled--were Black Americans. Comparable figures for 1968 and 1965 were 5.6 percent and 4.5 percent, respectively.

Almost 40 percent of all the Black students were enrolled in 111 majority-Black institutions. Only 4.2 percent of the medical students, 3.9 percent of the law students, and 3.6 percent of the dental students were Black.[47]

We can note that some progress is being made to expand equal educational opportunity in higher education. The proportion of ethnic minorities enrolled in these institutions remains considerably lower than their approximate population proportions of the general public.

## Summary

In his book, Shaping Educational Policy, James B. Conant says that "it is my belief there will be more radical changes in the future and this in turn means that our old methods of determining educational policy need drastic revision to meet the impact of the educational revolution."[48] Thus, at long last some efforts have resulted in change in educational policy as America begins to make higher education available to large segments of our society which has been denied effective roles in college education.

We have noted that state, institutions, foundations and the federal government have all been involved in expanding the concepts of higher education to meet the needs of aspiring ethnic minorities.

---

[47] Ibid.

[48] James B. Conant, Shaping Educational Policy (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1964), p. 4.

Collectively, without careful scrutiny, these efforts could well appear impressive. However, when total effort is related to the total need, effort is seen as continuing to lag. A continuing major problem with programs already in operation at the several institutions of higher learning, is the dire need to evaluate these Special Admissions Programs. It is to that need which this research is directed. Let us turn to the design of this study to see how this one additional important piece of research can contribute to academic and society's need to know how effective Special Admissions Programs have been in four colleges and universities since 1966.

## Design of This Study

A limited knowledge is available at this point about the total or partial impact these Special Admissions Programs have had on General Admissions Policy and the overall conduct of the university. The state college and university system in California has several Special Admissions Programs in operation, but this study will research the effectiveness of just four.

Given that the public institutions of higher learning in California are designed to serve local and regional populations, the racial and ethnic socio-economic characteristics of the student populations in the various institutions should have reflected the approximate racial and ethnic socio-economic population characteristics of the areas which they serve.

In designing this study, attention was given to the purpose, definition of a research problem, sources and treatment of data, methodology of data collection, and analysis of data.

## The Purpose of This Study

The American ideals and ideas are based upon equality for all citizens. As we have seen, this concept has been extended recently to include the heretofore sacred domains of higher education. Leaders, national, state and local, have voiced the commitment of our country to equal access to higher education, and that expansion should not stop short of universal opportunity for all people.[49]

As this concept is implemented in the several institutions, the need arises to research and evaluate the effectiveness of such efforts on a systematic basis. This study, then, is designed to satisfy a portion of that need. The utilization of Special Admissions Programs is only one method currently being experimented with to recruit and educate more students with ethnic minority identity. Educational Opportunity Programs are one form of special admissions used in the state and university system in California. Educational Opportunity grants were especially designed for lower socio-economic students who complete high school and are capable of maintaining good standing in college courses.

The need to systematically research and evaluate special programs is particularly acute when viewed from the perspective that masses of ethnic minorities bring to the college campus a summation of their life experiences. These life experiences have taught them harsh lessons about the evils of segregation and white racism in the "American Society." The needs, interests, desires, and aspirations of these new students are somewhat different from the traditional "college type." They are not all the docile, conforming type, but are searching for new methods and avenues to build a better society for themselves and their children. Value systems and cultural ties are not altogether the same as the normal high and middle socio-economic class student conveniently found at the university.

---

[49] Robert L. Jacobson, "French Promises, Junior College 'Cover' Plan," Chronicle of Higher Education, Vol. 4, No. 3 (October, 1969), p. 4.

The challenge for higher education is to gain a measure of understanding of this "new student" and hopefully make education take one step closer to being compatible with the interests of its students. As late as Spring, 1971, the Newman Report had this to say:

> As we examined the growth of higher education in the post-war period, we have seen disturbing trends toward uniformity in our institutions, growing bureaucracy, overemphasis on academic credentials, isolation of students and faculty from the world--a growing rigidity and uniformity of structure that makes higher education reflect less and less the interests of society. Rather than allow these trends to continue, means must be found to create a diverse and responsive system--we must enlarge our concepts of who can be a student, and when, and what a college is.[50]

This study is designed to help higher education better understand this new student.

In meeting this new challenge, we must not fail to recognize that a greater portion of the "new students" are poor and have not had the best opportunity to develop their respective academic, social, and industrial skills. Crippled by the lack of equal opportunity in public schools before reaching the college, these students will require special services which must be met and evaluated. Can the so-called "disadvantaged" student perform on a par with his more affluent peers? Have the ethnic characteristics of students and graduates changed during the duration of these special programs in the institutions studied? How does the performance of Special Admissions Students compare with the performance of General Admissions Students from similar socio-economic backgrounds who did not take part in the special services provided? Did the Special Admissions Programs contain provisions or procedures which were subsequently incorporated into the General Admissions Policies in any or all of the four institutions? If this happened, when and how did it happen in the opinions of the administrators who are responsible for the conduct of these Special Admissions Programs?

---

[50] Newman, op. cit., p. vii.

These are the major concerns of this study and primarily emphasis will be focused upon the perspectives of the respective college officers concerned who were interviewed during this research. The purpose was to learn first-hand how the interviewees perceived this impact over a period of five years (1966-1967 through 1970-1971).

## Definition of a Research Problem

This investigation researched the actual impact of Special Admissions Programs on General Admissions policies in four San Francisco

Bay Area public institutions of higher learning for the period 1966-1967 through 1970-1971. The study involved identifying specific areas of difference between the special admissions programs and the general admissions policies which allowed greater numbers of ethnic minorities and lower socio-economic individuals an opportunity to earn a higher education. This study focused upon specific administrative policies which not only made higher education available to disadvantaged youths, but also, those determinants contributing to the success or failure of such students once admitted. This was done through the use of a focused interview questionnaire with college administrators including Admissions Officers, Educational Opportunity Program officers, and the Directors of Financial Aid in the institutions comprising the population.

## Sources and Treatment of Data

The data used in this study consisted of three levels of research: Basic Data, Complementary, and Supplementary.

### Basic Data

1. Basic data consisted of information gathered through the use of the focused interview questionnaire. (Appendix I-A.)
2. Information contained in reports secured from the institutions in the study. (Appendix I-B)

### Complementary Data

1. Complementary data used in this research included infor-

mation gained through the use of a letter (see Appendix I-D), a copy of which was sent to the Department of Higher Education in each of the fifty states.[51]

2. Information gained through the use of a letter (see Appendix I-C), a copy of which was sent to more than twenty professional organizations involved in service to Higher Education in America.
3. Communication with several professionals, scholars, and research organizations relative to the purpose of this proposal.

## Supplementary Data

1. The supplementary research data included information gained through research of selected bibliography including relevant readings and population reports from the Bureau of Census of the United States Department of Commerce.
2. General research supportive of equal access and educational administration in colleges and universities.

## Methodology of Data Collection

Before collecting data, the Admissions Officer and his associate or assistant were identified at the specific institutions used as the population of this study. The Director of Educational Opportunity (EOP) and the Director of Financial Aid were subsequently identified.

Appointments with the prospective interviewees were made in advance, and each administrator was then interviewed separately.

---

[51] A summary of responses to this letter provided very little information relative to the purpose of this research, and consequently was unusable.

A focused interview questionnaire had been developed earlier; it was used to gather the basic data. Responses were recorded during the interview and on the instrument used.

Distinctions were made between the college administrators' perceptions and what actually occurred. This was done by writing the word "perception" or "estimate" where applicable on the focused interview data gathering instrument.

During the interviews, the word "hard" was written beside any and all data which represented "factual" or written information taken from a report or records.

Subsequent to the interview, each administrator was presented with a list of reports needed to complete the data-gathering process and respectfully requested to provide information relative to his/her respective office.

This was a study in the Administration of Higher Education. It sought to identify the impact of Special Admissions Programs on General Admissions Policies in each institution during the five years between 1966-1967 and 1970-1971, inclusively.

## Analysis of Data

The analysis of the data was primarily the process of organizing the collected data, relating and comparing them to the potential and practical influence on admissions policies in institutions of higher learning for greater equality of educational opportunity. Treatment of the data indicated specific alternatives and procedures implemented by the institutions studied and determined what happened, the variations of determinants, and the relative effectiveness of actions taken.

Hopefully, this study illuminated areas of impact which can be helpful to admissions officers and other administrators in higher education in determining both short- and long-term implications for updated equitable admissions policies. Also, it is trusted that this study will add significantly to the short list of evaluative research of Special Admissions Programs at institutions of higher learning and inspire others to continue the task.

## Summary of the Design of the Study

The sample population was drawn by identifying college administrators who have the responsibility of executing the General Admissions Policies and those who developed and/or implemented the Special Admissions Programs in the four institutions chosen.

Recent findings indicated that ethnic minorities and lower socio-economic individuals were disproportionately lacking in the student populations of the sample institutions with regard to the total population of the local and regional area.

Institutions of Higher Education used in this research are listed below:

1. San Jose State College, San Jose, California
2. Hayward State College, Hayward, California
3. San Francisco State College, San Francisco, California
4. University of California, Berkeley, California

The most complicated problem in this study was to ascertain the significant differences and similarities, if any, in the General Admissions Policies and Special Admissions Programs in the several institutions and between the schools studied. Special Admissions Programs were designed to recruit more underprivileged students from the Black community and other lower socio-economic culture isolated pockets of our society.

## Some Research Assertions and Expectations

The following is a discussion of some of the assertions and expectations which characterized this investigation.

1. Provisions under Special Admissions Programs will be in effect very little different from the General Admissions Policies in predating special programs.

This research assertion and expectation is projected in view of the following:

1.1 In part due to the restrictions and guidelines set forth in The California Master Plan for Higher Education, under which state colleges accept the top 33-1/3 percent and the university accepts the top 12-1/2 percent of the state's high school graduating class each year.

1.2 In part by B. S. Hollinshead's conclusion that the top 25 percent of college age youth in academic ability should pursue the baccalaureate degree.[52] This statement does not consider the vast number of possible college students who do not fit into the traditional "college age" group.

---

[52] B. S. Hollinshead, Who Should Go To College? (New York: Columbia University Press, 1952), p. 25.

1.3 In part by Dr. William Jones, Director of Foods Research, Stanford University, who recently suggested to this writer that "The universities have always had provisions for special students."[53] Also, Theodore M. Newcomb suggested in "Open Admissions: Before the Deluge," that we have been expanding the admissions policies and curricular offerings for several decades now.

1.4 In view of the fact that political influence on state institutions of higher learning has and will continue to limit the numbers and types of students attending these universities.[54]

1.5 Also, together with research cited earlier, we add the conclusions of Stephen Tonsor (1971), Spiro Agnew (1970), James Conant (1947), Sidney Hook (1964), B. S. Hollinshead (1952), and others that state colleges and universities should remain or be restored to scholarship and research for a highly selective group of students and academicians.

1.6 Finally, this assertion and expectation is made because of what is expected to be revealed through use of reports secured from the institutions and the data gathered through the use of the focused interview questionnaire.

---

[53] Statement made to Howard Alford during the summer of 1971 at Stanford University by Dr. William Jones, Director of Foods Research at Stanford.

[54] Peter Scrag, "Open Admissions to What?" in Philip R. Rivers (ed.), Open Admissions and Equal Access (Washington, D.C.: The American College Testing Program, Monograph No. 4, 1971), p. 49.

2. Specific variations and provisions employed with the expressed purpose of recruiting and educating more students with minority ethnic identity tended to be temporary and without lasting significant input. Factors listed below contribute to the rationale for this projected expectation and assertion:

    2.1 In part because "Minority student enrollment was more a response to than a cause of persistent pressures for campus changes."[55]

    2.2 In part, recognizing that minority students tend to need greater financial aid, as do other "special" students and institutions depend largely upon foundations for grants, and that the Ford Foundation and other foundations principally support programs limited to a set duration (Dr. Michael Kirst's joint program in Business and Education at Stanford University, 1969-1971, and grant to Stanford University in 1969-1970 for development of an undergraduate Black Studies Program, and others).[56]

    2.3 In part considering that, while traditional White institutions want to integrate their student body, recent research concluded that "Most respondents expressed a positive but cautious view of continuing increases in minority enrollment."[57]

---

[55] Fred E. Crossland, Minority Access to College (New York: Schocken Brooks, 1971), p. 95.

[56] Ibid., p. 126.

2.4 Recognizing the experience at Antioch College which cited the need for greater financial aid than the school could give to both continue their multi-cultural education center and to recruit additional students from the Spanish-American and Native-American ranks.[58]

2.5 Also, since colleges and universities have for some decades had several more applications than space for students, in such cases it is often Blacks and other ethnic minorities who are left out.[59]

2.6 And, "Higher Education cannot plead innocence for the conditions which permit only a token number of poor Negroes to enter and graduate from college. In the last two years, three major reports commissioned by the Office of Education, the Civil Rights Commission, and the White House have indicted the American educational system for failure to provide equal educational opportunities for low-income, minority youth of our nation."[60]

---

[57] College Entrance Examination Board, Admissions of Minority Students in Midwestern Colleges (Evanston, Ill.: Higher Education Surveys, Report M-1, May, 1970), p. 1.

[58] Jewel Graham, "The Antioch Program for Inter-racial Education: A Five Year Report, 1964-1969," an unpublished report. (Yellow Springs, Ohio: July, 1969), p. 44.

[59] Davis, op. cit., p. 4.

[60] Staff and Students of Experiment in Higher Education, Higher

2.7 Also, this expectation and assertion is made in view of Roger Heyn's third of four considerations he felt were certain facts on which the future of the University of California, Berkeley, rested: "Higher education is a long way from providing equal access for minority groups and formidable financial difficulties remain for minority students."[61]

2.8 Additionally, it can be noted that state colleges and the university system in California is limited in its freedom of admissions policies by the Master Plan for Higher Education in California for 1960-1975.

2.9 And also, in part, by the fact that some states such as North Dakota and New York who presently employ an open admissions policy at state public institutions of higher learning are saying that "large enrollment increases in the immediate future, coupled with inadequate physical facilities and a shortage of staff, make this open enrollment policy im-

---

Education for the Disadvantaged (East St. Louis, Ill.: Southern Illinois University at Edwardsville, June, 1968), p. 14. Also, St. Clair Drake says that Blacks are "victimized by the American culture which prevents them from equal access to desirable materials and nonmaterial products of the society." Found in Institutional Racism in America (edited by Louis L. Knowles and Kenneth Prewitt), p. 1. This book discusses institutionalized racism in America and how it systematically excludes or limits the participation of Blacks in the American society.

[61] Roger Heyns, "Berkeley: Yesterday, Today and Tomorrow," in Charles E. Dobbins (ed.), Educational Record, Vol. 52, No. 3 (Washington, D.C.: American Council of Education, Summer, 1971), p. 255.

possible."[62]

2.10 A summation of the basis for making this research assertion and expectation also includes the difficulty of effecting change in the administration of colleges and universities, which includes the administrative styles and structures as cited by Lewis B. Mayhew in Colleges Today and Tomorrow (1970); "Faculty in Campus Governance," in The Agony and the Promise, (1969); "And Now, The Future," in Twenty Five Years (1970); Nevitt Sanford in The American College (1964); "Loss of Talent," in Issues of the Seventies (1970); "Stress and Administrative Authority," by Roger Heyns and "Faculty and Administrative Roles in Decision Making," by John C. Livingston, both of which are found in Stress and Campus Response (1968); "Governance and Educational Reform," by Howard R. Bowen; "Academic Senate Under Fire," by John C. Livingston and "Who Decides, Who Decides?" by Harold Hodgkinson found in The Agony and the Promise (1969); "The Disenfranchised on Campus," by Morris Keeton, and "New Configurations in Governance," by W. Max Wise found in The Troubled Campus (1970); and Morris Keeton's Shared Authority on Campuses (1971).

3. The average G.P.A. earned by students admitted under "Special"

---

[62] The State Board of Higher Education Facilities Commission, "A Working Master Plan for Higher Education in North Dakota Colleges and Universities," A Report to the Legislature and the People of North Dakota. Unpublished document. (Bismarck: 1968), p. 9.

admissions provisions equalled the average G.P.A. earned by the general student body.

In addition to the research in the first part of this chapter, this assertion and expectation is based on the following:

3.1 In part on the report of the National Youth Administration (NYA) in 1935 during which time 365 colleges reported that those students participating in the NYA program generally maintained higher scholastic standards than the "average" student in college. Approximately 58,000 students participated in the study.[63]

3.2 In part, by the statement made by Sidney Sulkin about how well Black students perform at predominantly white colleges: that "their college grades run about average."[64]

3.3 In part by the findings of The Special Program Task Force and Evaluation made in June, 1970, at Stanford University, which suggested that the total weighted G.P.A. of special students was approximately the same as those of the General Admissions students. This concept is also supported by John Bonnell, Assistant Admissions Officer at Stanford. Mr. Bonnell did not take part in developing the report.

---

[63] Ralph W. McDonald (ed.), Current Problems in Higher Education. Report of the National Conference on Higher Education, sponsored by the National Education Association (1947), p. 44.

[64] Sidney Sulkin, Complete Planning for College (New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1968), p. 224.

3.4 In part on the findings of Dr. Jeanette Benjamin and Philip Powell who studied the grades of Open Admissions students at City University of New York and concluded that "the results clearly show that significant numbers of high-risk students are capable of making progress toward a degree during the first semester."[65]

3.5 In part by the results of a recent Restricted Transfer Program which had been instituted as an attempt to better understand students who experienced failure, and to gather data on which to establish future admissions policies. The mean overall G.P.A. of these 'special' students was 2.27, while the mean G.P.A. for regulars was 2.53.[66]

3.6 Also, in part, by the recent data which indicated that Educational Opportunity Programs were resulting in 71 percent of Special Admissions Students achieving a "C" average or better and that the median G.P.A. was as high as 2.75 in one state college.[67]

---

[65] Jeannette A. Benjamin and Philip E. Powell, "Open Admissions: Expanding Educational Opportunity," in Bettie J. Soldwedel (ed.), Journal of the National Association of Women Deans and Counselors, Vol. 15, No. 4 (Washington, D.C.: February, 1971), p. 147.

[66] Victor P. Maskill, "Success of Academic Failures," in Donald Nugent (ed.), Journal of the National Association of College Admissions Counselors, Vol. 15, No. 4 (Washington, D.C.: February, 1971), p. 15.

[67] Coordinating Council on Higher Education, Educational Opportunity Programs, 1969-1970. Council Report 71-5. Unpublished document. (Sacramento, Ca.: State Department of Education, April, 1971), pp. 13-15.

3.7 And finally, the data associated with the support of research assertion and expectation number four (4) of this paper, also applies here.

4. The average program and degree progress for Special Admissions Students equalled the average program and degree progress for General Admissions Students.

This research assertion and expectation is based in part on the following:

4.1 In part on the results of a recent study involving "Special Admits" which showed that the students who came to the university under these conditions remained there with one exception (that particular student left for non-academic reasons), and there existed reason to believe that almost all of these students were maintaining satisfactory levels of performance and progress toward a degree.[68]

4.2 Brown University recently studied the post-college achievement of high-risk students (all students, not just minorities, whose entering SAT scores were 100 points or more below the norm for Brown) and found no discernible differences from the achievement of its regular entrants.[69]

---

[68] Prepared by Ann Mothershead, Special Program Task Force and Evaluation, April 1968 - June 1970. A Report Submitted by the Special Task Force Committee, an unpublished document. (Stanford: Stanford University, 1970), p 77.

[69] Newman, op. cit., p. 60.

4.3 In part, in light of recent research involving 180 Midwestern colleges which concluded that positive outcomes were reported for three-fourths of all students in developmental programs.[70]

4.4 Also, this projection is advanced on the strengths of a summary of recent research findings stating that "In general, Educational Opportunity Students (EOP) are as successful as non-EOP students as measured by both grade point levels and rates of retention in their respective schools."[71]

4.5 In part, this statement is based upon what is expected to be learned through reports secured from the respective institutions and data gathered with the research instrument (focused interview questionnaire).

4.6 In concluding, it can be said that supportive studies found on the preceding pages of this paper (research and expectations number 3) also apply to this projection.

Summary

We have noted in this chapter that traditional forms of college admissions tended to move from selective to highly selective with preferential treatment in the admissions of students going consistently to the affluent, upper and middle socio-economic class individuals, and children whose parents were college graduates or professionals. While these successes can be pointed to with pride, we also noted that such criteria perpetually denied masses of students with low test scores, low grades, ethnic minorities, poverty stricken youths and others who were not the traditional "college type." The limited scope in admissions policies designed to serve the institution's own narrow goals and self interest, screened out the poor and screened in the rich or highly intelligent as evidenced by test scores and grades.

---

[70] Richard I. Ferrin, Developmental Programs in Midwestern Community Colleges. Higher Education Survey Report No. 4 (Evanston, Ill.: College Entrance Examination Board, February, 1971), p. 3.

[71] Harry L. Kitano and Dorothy L. Miller, An Assessment of Educational Opportunity Programs in California Higher Education. San Francisco: Scientific Analysis Corporation, February, 1970), p. 1.

The particularly acute problem, Who Should Go to College?, was discussed, and we learned that the bridge spanned a gulf stretching from the "highly intellectual" (Conant, 1947) to universal higher education for all (Carnegie Commission, 1970). We also noted the continuing debate over whether access to higher education is a privilege (Moynihan, 1971), or a basic right (Willingham, 1970). While differences of opinions and perspectives in this arena continued the debate, efforts were extended to provide equality of educational opportunity. This effort has been made by state, federal, institutional and foundation leadership through the use of Special Admissions Programs, financing, and special projects. Culminating this section was the recognition that ethnic minorities on college campuses did increase during the decade of the sixties and particularly since 1968, with the expiration of Dr. Martin Luther King, a noted civil rights leader.

Toward the end of this chapter, we began to recognize the need for research and evaluations of the several efforts currently being extended to provide higher education for lower socio-economic and ethnic minority students. This research was designed and executed in the particular hope of fulfilling the need to learn the relative effectiveness of Special Admissions Programs. The purpose of this study was to identify the impact of Special Admissions Programs on General Admissions Policies in only four San Francisco Bay Area public institutions of higher learning. By developing a focused interview questionnaire, identifying the populations, and planning to gather data, the researcher proceeded to Sonoma State College, where a case study was made of the possible effectiveness of research. It is to that "case study" that I now turn.

# CHAPTER II

## PRETESTING INSTRUMENTS, A CASE STUDY

> An American Indian student entered the EOP with a .92 high school grade point average. After three quarters in the University, he has a cumulative GPA of 3.25. . . .
> --(EOP) University of Washington (1971)

This chapter will address the definition of General Admissions, Special Admissions, the need for pretesting instruments, how the sample institution was chosen as a case study, what was done at the sample institution, and a summary of findings.

### General Admissions

General Admissions requirements for the several California State Colleges are outlined in Title 5, Chapter 5, Subchapter 2 of the California Administrative Code, as amended by the Board of Trustees of the California State Colleges on November 24, 1970. For California high school graduates and residents:

> An applicant who is a graduate of a California High School or a legal resident for tuition purposes must have a grade point average and composite score on the SAT or ACT which provides an eligibility index placing him among the upper one-third of California high school graduates. The grade point average is based upon the last three years and does not include physical education or military science.[1] The table below does not

---

[1] Bulletin, San Jose State College, San Jose, California. Vol. 52, No. 3 (1970-1972), p. 22.

> cover every case, but gives several examples of the test score needed with a given grade point average to be eligible for admission.

TABLE II-1

SAMPLE OF ELIGIBILITY INDEX FOR CALIFORNIA HIGH SCHOOL GRADUATES TO GAIN ADMISSION TO CALIFORNIA STATE COLLEGES

| Grade Point Average | SAT/ACT Needed |
|---|---|
| 3.21 and above | Eligible with any score |
| 2.80 | 832/19 |
| 2.40 | 1152/27 |
| 2.00 | 1472/35 |
| 1.99 and below | Not eligible |

Source: Bulletin, San Jose State College, San Jose, California, 1970-1971, and 1971-1972, Vol. 52, No. 3 (1970), p. 22.

> For 1970-71, the minimum eligibility index for ACT was 741 and for SAT, 3072. ACT eligibility index is computed by multiplying grade point average by 200 and adding it to 10 times the composite ACT score. SAT eligibility index is computed by multiplying the grade point average by 800 and adding it to the total SAT score.[2]

This basic eligibility index qualifies an applicant to be admitted to any of the California State Colleges, and General Admissions students are those students who meet this basic criteria. More will be said about General Admissions in Chapter III.

---

[2] Ibid.

## Special Admissions Programs

In this paper, Special Admissions Programs will include all students who were admitted to the public institutions of higher learning (used in this study) who did not meet the basic eligibility index discussed above. These efforts are not always known as Special Admissions Programs but are sometimes referred to simply as Special Admits or Special Students or "Specials." These terms used in this research all connote Special Admissions Students and as such include all entering freshmen students not satisfying the eligibility index.

In recent years, the largest Special Admissions Program being operated in the California State Colleges is the Educational Opportunity Programs (EOP).

The Sonoma State College's E.O.P. office, called Hidden Talent, had defined its project in 1969 as a program designed for "disadvantaged" youngsters and interpreted "disadvantaged" in terms of educational, psychological and economically shut-outs from the mainstream of American life. It concluded with the following statement: "The Hidden Talent Project is rather unique. It differs from all other college programs and is strongly 'people'-oriented. The program seeks to provide the educational experience to that segment of the population formerly ignored and rejected by higher education and society in general. Hidden Talent favors the poor and is a 'reaching out' program which encourages the 'drop out,' the unmotivated, and in general, students who at an early age have 'given up.' These students have demonstrated in both behavior and attitude many of the failures of regular educational processes which have been provided for them. The projections for the Hidden Talent student are to help him reach his scale of independence, to help him function within the college on his own initiative without the supportive aids of the project."[3]

In sum, we can say that the basic difference between General Admissions and Special Admissions is that General Admissions Students meet a criterion based upon an eligibility index while Special students are those who not only fail to meet this criterion, but also are disadvantaged in other areas including psychological, economic, or culturally. It is to these students--the dropouts, the unmotivated, the cultural isolates, the economically oppressed, the downtrodden, the hopeless and ethnic minorities--which this study is directed. In executing the purposes of this research, the need for pretesting instruments was acknowledged.

### The Need to Pretest Instruments

With the use of focused interview questionnaires, this study was directed to securing information relative to specific questions in order to evaluate the effectiveness of "Special Admissions Programs." More specifically, we wanted to know the following, for five years ending June, 1971. The questionnaire was composed of six parts, with each part addressing one of the first six items below:

---

[3] W. P. Populus, Hidden Talent Project: Annual Report 1969-70 (Rohnert Park, Ca.: Sonoma State College, 1970), pp. 2-3.

1. What specific institutional general admissions policies were waived for the Special Admissions programs?
2. What special services (in tutoring, financial aid, housing, assistance, etc.) were provided students during the operation of the Special Admissions programs?
3. How, in the judgment of college administrators, had the racial and ethnic composition of the student body changed as a result of the Special Admissions programs?
4. What were the perceptions of interviewees of the performance of students admitted under the Special Admissions program relative to the performance of students of similar backgrounds (socio-economic status), who were admitted under the general admissions policies and did not participate in the special services mentioned above?
5. What were the perceptions of college administrators of the performance of special admissions students relative to the performance of students from the general student body?
6. What portions, if any, of these Special Admissions policies and operational procedures had been stated officially in the general admissions policy?
7. How did the general admissions policies and the Special Admissions programs compare in each of the institutions?

In order to do the above, there existed a need to pre-test instruments to determine validity and reliability. We needed to determine whether these instruments were practical, adequate, sound, logical, and measured what they were intended to measure. Also, we needed to know whether or not the instruments could be depended upon to measure the same, or approximately the same, data consistently in different institutions over a period of time.

Academia, higher education and all concerned with expanding educational opportunity need to know what perspectives administrators had, who were primarily responsible for the execution of both General Admissions and Special Admissions provisions. Also, we needed to know how these perceptions compared with information contained in records and reports kept by the respective schools. There existed a need to determine the length of time required to complete each interview. The quality, type and availability of records and reports needed to be predetermined in connection with the scope and aims of this research.

### Choosing an Institution for Pretesting

The design of this study was projected to examine the conduct and effectiveness of Special Admissions Programs in San Francisco Bay Area public institutions of higher education. In choosing a sample institution, the rationale was that the school should be:

> A California State College,
>
> Should have similar general admissions policies as those to be studied in the Bay Area,
>
> Should have Special Admissions Programs similar to those in the San Francisco Bay Area public senior institutions of higher education,
>
> Either near enough to the Bay Area to be influenced

> by its culture or located in a geographical setting which served a population with varying numbers of ethnic minorities.

The sample institution should be outside the immediate San Francisco Bay Area, accommodating a population of surrounding counties with less comparative ethnic minority group persons than typically found in the Bay Area.

In sum, it should be stated that the criteria for selecting an institution for pretesting were based on three premises: 1) to determine the validity and reliability of the data-gathering instruments, 2) to determine the availability of appropriate records and reports, and 3) selection of a California State College with similar admission programs and serving a population with various numbers of ethnic minorities.

After considering several possible state colleges, Sonoma State College at Rohnert Park, California, was chosen for the case study. This school is located approximately 65 miles north of San Francisco, in a rural setting which has less proportional ethnic minorities in the six surrounding counties than the San Francisco Bay Area.

## What Was Done at Sonoma State

Once the sample institution was chosen, the researcher proceeded to contact the institution and identified persons to be interviewed. These were the Director of Admissions and Records, the Director of Educational Opportunity Programs (EOP), and the Director of Financial Aid. These administrators were primarily responsible for executing the provisions of the respective admissions programs.

A time and place for each interview was arranged with the respective administrators, and each administrator was interviewed separately. Questions were asked directly from the questionnaire, and responses were recorded on the instrument. The Director of EOP was unavailable for an interview and the Associate Director was interviewed. The Associate had been with the program (Hidden Talent) from its beginning (1968), while the Director was relatively new in his office. The responses of each interviewee were recorded on the questionnaire and each individual was thanked for his/her cooperation at the termination of each interview. Respondents were then given a sheet, outlining a list of reports and records which were needed to complement this research; they were requested to provide such information as pertained to their office.

## What Was Learned Operationally

The summary of data collected will be treated in the next section; however, operationally, the following were realized:

> It was very important to plan an appointment in advance to interview administrators.
>
> The interview consumed from one and one-half hours to two hours and should not be completed during one sitting without the insistence of the interviewee.
>
> The Director of Financial Aids (not considered in the initial proposal) should be interviewed particularly with reference to financial assistance provided to the students.
>
> Financial aid was given in packages with transportation, cost of living, books and supplies, etc., included, and

all estimates were relative to this summation, which should be so recorded on the instruments.

Estimates relative to racial and ethnic characteristics of students and graduates were made on a yearly basis or not at all without respect to the number of freshmen, sophomores, juniors or seniors. These yearly estimates were recorded on the data-gathering instruments.

The sixth column on parts four (4) and five (5) of the interview questionnaire should be headed "no opinion."

Records relative to racial and ethnic characteristics of students and graduates did not exist. The colleges had been forbidden to request such information before 1968, and subsequently students would not complete required forms correctly.[4]

For the interpretation of abbreviations used in questionnaire and tables, the following should be observed:

GAP = General Admissions Policy

SAP = Special Admissions Programs

GAS = General Admissions Students

SAS = Special Admissions Students

Respective administrators needed time to make available reports and records relative to the prosecution of this research.

In sum, it should be noted that the choice of Sonoma State College was definitely relevant to the purpose of this study. Operational adjustments were subsequently adhered to and a summary of data gathered follows. One should note that statements relative to data collected in the summary of findings represent the opinions and perspectives of administrators interviewed unless otherwise indicated.

---

[4] Interview with Mr. Harold J. Salters, Director of Admissions and Records, Sonoma State College, October, 1971.

## Summary of Findings

The focused interview questionnaire consisted of six (6) parts, with each part (question) designed to gather specific information. A summary of the findings with the six-part questionnaire will follow in chronological order. Part 1 was about the admission criteria and included the general question and 19 subset questions.

Question 1: What specific institutional General Admissions Policies were waived for the Special Admissions Program?

### 1. Admissions

As indicated earlier, the primary admission criterion for State Colleges consisted of a relationship between grade point averages (GPA) and test scores on the American College Test (ACT) or the Scholastic Aptitude Test (SAT) which, taken collectively, provide an eligibility index for California's high school graduates (see Table II-2). This was continually identified by each person interviewed. While Table II-1 showed examples of how the eligibility index might look for certain applicants, Table II-2 represents a detailed eligibility index.

This eligibility table is used for all General Admissions Students (GAS) who are entering for the first time, and who have fewer than 60 semester or 90 quarter hours (college credits) completed with a "C" average or better.[5]

---

[5] The California State Colleges, Los Angeles, California: "Information for Prospective Students and Admission-Readmission Application Forms for the Academic Year 1972-73," 1971, p. 3.

TABLE II-2

ADMISSIONS ELIGIBILITY TABLE FOR CALIFORNIA HIGH SCHOOL GRADUATES TO CALIFORNIA STATE COLLEGES

| G.P.A. | A.C.T. Score | S.A.T. Score | G.P.A. | A.C.T. Score | S.A.T. Score | G.P.A. | A.C.T. Score | S.A.T. Score | G.P.A. | A.C.T. Score | S.A.T. Score | G.P.A. | A.C.T. Score | S.A.T. Score |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| (——)[1] | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3.20 | 11 | 512 | 2.94 | 16 | 720 | 2.68 | 21 | 928 | 2.42 | 26 | 1136 | 2.16 | 31 | 1344 |
| 3.19 | 11 | 520 | 2.93 | 16 | 728 | 2.67 | 21 | 936 | 2.41 | 26 | 1144 | 2.15 | 32 | 1352 |
| 3.18 | 11 | 528 | 2.92 | 16 | 736 | 2.66 | 21 | 944 | 2.40 | 27 | 1152 | 2.14 | 32 | 1360 |
| 3.17 | 11 | 536 | 2.91 | 16 | 744 | 2.65 | 22 | 952 | 2.39 | 27 | 1160 | 2.13 | 32 | 1368 |
| 3.16 | 11 | 544 | 2.90 | 17 | 752 | 2.64 | 22 | 960 | 2.38 | 27 | 1168 | 2.12 | 32 | 1376 |
| 3.15 | 12 | 552 | 2.89 | 17 | 760 | 2.63 | 22 | 968 | 2.37 | 27 | 1176 | 2.11 | 32 | 1384 |
| 3.14 | 12 | 560 | 2.88 | 17 | 768 | 2.62 | 22 | 976 | 2.36 | 27 | 1184 | 2.10 | 33 | 1392 |
| 3.13 | 12 | 568 | 2.87 | 17 | 776 | 2.61 | 22 | 984 | 2.35 | 28 | 1192 | 2.09 | 33 | 1400 |
| 3.12 | 12 | 576 | 2.86 | 17 | 784 | 2.60 | 23 | 992 | 2.34 | 28 | 1200 | 2.08 | 33 | 1408 |
| 3.11 | 12 | 584 | 2.85 | 18 | 792 | 2.59 | 23 | 1000 | 2.33 | 28 | 1208 | 2.07 | 33 | 1416 |
| 3.10 | 13 | 592 | 2.84 | 18 | 800 | 2.58 | 23 | 1008 | 2.32 | 28 | 1216 | 2.06 | 33 | 1424 |
| 3.09 | 13 | 600 | 2.83 | 18 | 808 | 2.57 | 23 | 1016 | 2.31 | 28 | 1224 | 2.05 | 34 | 1432 |
| 3.08 | 13 | 608 | 2.82 | 18 | 816 | 2.56 | 23 | 1024 | 2.30 | 29 | 1232 | 2.04 | 34 | 1440 |
| 3.07 | 13 | 616 | 2.81 | 18 | 824 | 2.55 | 24 | 1032 | 2.29 | 29 | 1240 | 2.03 | 34 | 1448 |
| 3.06 | 13 | 624 | 2.80 | 19 | 832 | 2.54 | 24 | 1040 | 2.28 | 29 | 1248 | 2.02 | 34 | 1456 |
| 3.05 | 14 | 632 | 2.79 | 19 | 840 | 2.53 | 24 | 1048 | 2.27 | 29 | 1256 | 2.01 | 34 | 1464 |
| 3.04 | 14 | 640 | 2.78 | 19 | 848 | 2.52 | 24 | 1056 | 2.26 | 29 | 1264 | 2.00 | 35 | 1472 |
| 3.03 | 14 | 648 | 2.77 | 19 | 856 | 2.51 | 24 | 1064 | 2.25 | 30 | 1272 | (——)[2] | | |
| 3.02 | 14 | 656 | 2.76 | 19 | 864 | 2.50 | 25 | 1072 | 2.24 | 30 | 1280 | | | |
| 3.01 | 14 | 664 | 2.75 | 20 | 872 | 2.49 | 25 | 1080 | 2.23 | 30 | 1288 | | | |
| 3.00 | 15 | 672 | 2.74 | 20 | 880 | 2.48 | 25 | 1088 | 2.22 | 30 | 1296 | | | |
| 2.99 | 15 | 680 | 2.73 | 20 | 888 | 2.47 | 25 | 1096 | 2.21 | 30 | 1304 | | | |
| 2.98 | 15 | 688 | 2.72 | 20 | 896 | 2.46 | 25 | 1104 | 2.20 | 31 | 1312 | | | |
| 2.97 | 15 | 696 | 2.71 | 20 | 904 | 2.45 | 26 | 1112 | 2.19 | 31 | 1320 | | | |
| 2.96 | 15 | 704 | 2.70 | 21 | 912 | 2.44 | 26 | 1120 | 2.18 | 31 | 1328 | | | |
| 2.95 | 16 | 712 | 2.69 | 21 | 920 | 2.43 | 26 | 1128 | 2.17 | 31 | 1336 | | | |

---

[1] Students earning grade point averages above 3.20 are eligible for admission.

[2] Students earning grade point averages below 2.00 are not eligible for admission.

The figures in Table II-2 are to be used for determining the eligibility of graduates of California high schools (or California legal residents) for freshman admission to a State College, beginning with the Fall 1967 admission cycle. Grade point averages are based on work completed in the last three years of high school, exclusive of physical education and military science. Scores shown are the SAT Total and the ACT Composite. Students with a given GPA must present the corresponding test score. Conversely, students with a given ACT or SAT score must present the corresponding GPA in order to be eligible.

The administrators interviewed agreed that the grades and test scores were very important and were always used in determining admission for General Admission students, but rank in high school graduating class was not a determinant. They also were in agreement with 2.00 being the lower GPA limit for general students, and that there were no lower GPA limits for "special" admission students.

While test scores and grade point averages (GPA) were waived for special admits, the "specials" were expected to secure letters of reference and interviews though not required, were encouraged. One respondent cited the Harmon Bill (1969) which requires letters of nomination for special students be made from previous schools, two community groups, or from public or private organizations. The Annual Report of Hidden Talent for 1969-1970 states under "Requirements," p. 5, that four letters of recommendation are needed to enter the project. One letter is to be addressed to the Director of EOP, expressing interest in the program, and three (3) letters of recommendation are to be from members of the community, high school principal, or any of the state designated agencies.

2. Special Services

Question 2: What specific services (financial, tutoring, counseling, aid, etc.) were offered students during the years between 1966-1967 and 1970-1971?

The respondents indicated that financial aid is given to students in packages. These packages include money for books, supplies, transportation, living expenses, housing, meals, etc., and the dollar value of each package is dependent upon the needs of individual students. It was with this understanding that estimates were made. Table II-3 indicates the estimates made by the three persons interviewed relative to the distribution of financial aid to both General Admissions students and Special Admissions students during the five years studied.

It can be noted in Table II-3 that no estimates were made for special students before 1968-1969. One respondent (number two) made no estimate for the two years ending June 1968, and his estimates suggest that approximately ten percent of the students receiving financial aid were Special Admits. The number of students estimated to have received aid by respondents number one and number three are closely related, and all respondents were relatively close to the actual number of students receiving aid, as indicated by the report in the office of the Director of Financial Aid. All the figures for total cost of financial aid represent estimates, and no record was available with which to compare these figures.

## TABLE II-3

## ESTIMATED AMOUNT OF FINANCIAL AID TO STUDENTS AT SONOMA STATE COLLEGE FOR THE YEARS 1966-67 THROUGH 1970-71

| Respondents | Year | Total Students | Approx. No. of Students Receiving Services | | Approx. % of Students Receiving Services | | % Increase or Decrease Prior Year | | Approx. Total Financial Value of Services Rendered | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | GAS | SAS | GAS | SAS | GAS | SAS | GAS | SAS |
| Respondent Number One | 1966-67 | 250 | 250 | 0 | 18 | 0 | | | $375,000 | $ None |
| | 1967-68 | 350 | 350 | 0 | 18 | 0 | | | 475,000 | None |
| | 1968-69 | 450 | 400 | 50 | 18 | 95 | | | 600,000 | 75,000 |
| | 1969-70 | 570 | 500 | 70 | 18 | 95 | | | 750,000 | 105,000 |
| | 1970-71 | 720 | 600 | 120 | 18 | 95 | | | 900,000 | 180,000 |
| Respondent Number Two | 1966-67 | | | | | | | | | |
| | 1967-68 | | | | | | | | | |
| | 1968-69 | 330 | 300 | 30 | 40 | 65 | | ** 0 | 600,000 | 60,000 |
| | 1969-70 | 440 | 400 | 40 | 40 | 65 | | ** 0 | 800,000 | 80,000 |
| | 1970-71 | 550 | 500 | 50 | 40 | 50 | | -15 | 1,000,000 | 100,000 |
| Respondent Number Three | 1966-67 | * 150 | 150 | 0 | 25 | | | | 100,000 | None |
| | 1967-68 | * 200 | 200 | 0 | 25 | | | | 200,000 | None |
| | 1968-69 | * 389 | 339 | 50 | 25 | | | | 340,000 | 65,000 |
| | 1969-70 | * 491 | 391 | 100 | 25 | | | | 490,000 | 150,000 |
| | 1970-71 | * 596 | 426 | 150 | 25 | | | | 600,000 | 225,000 |

* Indicates hard figure taken from a report in the office of the Director of Financial Aid.
** Indicates hard figure taken from a report; all other figures are estimates.

Source: Data gathered with the use of the focused interview questionnaire at Sonoma State College, October, 1971.

Tutorial services for EOP or Hidden Talent students were provided for the academic years of 1969-70 and 1970-71. The number of students receiving this service and total hours are shown in Table II-4. Only one person chose to advance an estimate of the magnitude of this effort at Sonoma State.

No estimates were made for general students, and the EOP students do not include all special admits; however, the interviewees reported that almost all the tutoring was done by the EOP office.

TABLE II-4

ESTIMATED NUMBER OF EOP STUDENTS RECEIVING TUTORIAL SERVICE DURING THE ACADEMIC YEARS 1969-1971 AT SONOMA STATE COLLEGE

| Year | No. of Students | Hours Weekly | No. of Weeks | Total No. of Hours | Approx. % of Students |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1969-70 | 78 | 2 | 32 | 4992 | 100% |
| 1970-71 | 103 | 2 | 32 | 6592 | 100% |

Source: Data gathered with use of the focused interview questionnaire at Sonoma State College, October, 1971.

The Hidden Talent Project Report for 1969 stated that only "one quarter of the Hidden Talent students registered with the tutorial center."[6] What can be noted is that the number of students (Special

---

[6] Hidden Talent Project, Annual Report 1969-70, Rohnert Park, California, W. P. Populus, Director, Sonoma State College, 1970. Unpublished document, p. 7.

Admits) was estimated to represent 100 percent of the EOP enrollees. This respondent also suggested that the tutorial program was very effective for the two years' duration. Other findings relative to services rendered showed the following:

Services provided to the students such as housing, finance, tutoring, counseling, etc. were not related to the admission criteria.

Admission officers have very little concept of who benefits from what kind of student services.

All respondents felt that health services provided students both GAS and SAS were minor medical, and all students utilized this service at some time during the course of an academic year.

Special students had been very active in student affairs, and held the office of president and vice-president of the student government in 1969-70. This, however, was not true before 1969, and after 1970 Special Admits declined considerably in participation in student affairs as reported by the interviewees.

### 3. Ethnic Characteristics of Students and Graduates

Question 3: What were the approximate racial and ethnic compositions of your total student populace for the academic years 1966-1967 through 1970-1971?

Reports relative to the composition of racial and ethnic identities among the students and graduates were non-existent. The administrators report that colleges were not allowed to ask questions regarding race and ethnic identification during 1966 through 1968, and subsequently, students would not complete the forms properly. Before constructing the tables showing individual perspectives, the estimates were studied to determine the high and low estimate of ethnic characteristics of the student populace. Table II-5 shows only the range (low and high) estimates of ethnic compositions of the students at Sonoma State during the five years studied.

As noted in Table II-5, the ethnic composition of students was largely White or Euro-American. Mexican-Americans and Blacks (according to these estimates) tended to begin enrolling in Fall, 1967, and gradually grew to an estimated high of 100 for Blacks and 50 for Mexican-Americans by Fall, 1971. One interviewee suggested that the school might have had a few American Indians enrolled throughout the five year period who did not identify with their ethnic group.

The Hidden Talent Project's Annual Report 1969 indicated that sixty-four (64) special admissions students had begun with the Project during its inaugural year of 1968-69. The report showed no racial or ethnic breakdown, but stated that twenty of the original group dropped out by the Fall of 1969 for a multiplicity of reasons.

Tables II-6, II-7, and II-8 represent the enrollment of EOP students in the fall of 1969 (Table II-6), ethnic distribution of all EOP students as of December, 1969 (Table II-7), and a summary of the 82 total students in the Hidden Talent project as of June, 1970 (Table II-8). Fall, 1969 marked the first time reports were kept at Sonoma State relative to ethnic composition of students in the Hidden Talent Project, according to the Director of Admissions and Records. It must

### TABLE II-5

### INTERVIEWEES' ESTIMATES OF THE TOTAL STUDENT ENROLLMENT BY ETHNIC GROUPS FROM 1966-1967 THROUGH 1970-1971 AT SONOMA STATE COLLEGE

| | Estimated Total Students for Each Year | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Ethnic Group | 1966-1967 | | 1967-1968 | | 1968-1969 | | 1969-1970 | | 1970-1971 | |
| | Low | High | Low | High | Low | High | Low | High | Low | High |
| A. Whites | 1000 | 1300 | 1100 | 1500 | 2000 | 2800 | 3000 | 3500 | 4000 | 4500 |
| B. Blacks | 2 | 4 | 1 | 6 | 30 | 50 | 30 | 68 | 40 | 50 |
| C. Chicanos | 0 | 4 | 1 | 5 | 20 | 40 | 15 | 48 | 40 | 50 |
| D. Amer. Ind. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 2 |
| E. Asian Amer. | 5 | 10 | 25 | 50 | 50 | 100 | 50 | 100 | 100 | 200 |
| F. Other | 10 | 15 | 30 | 50 | 50 | 75 | 50 | 100 | 100 | 150 |
| Est. Totals | 1017 | 1333 | 1157 | 1607 | 2151 | 3067 | 3146 | 3818 | 4305 | 5002 |
| Totals * | *1425 | | *1978 | | *2978 | | *3502 | | *4047 | |

* Indicates hard figures on enrollment taken from the Office of Admissions and annual reports at the institution.

Source: Data gathered with the use of the focused interview questionnaire at Sonoma State College, October, 1971.

## TABLE II-6

## ETHNIC DISTRIBUTION OF STUDENTS ADMITTED TO SONOMA STATE COLLEGE IN THE FALL OF 1969

| | Male | Female | Total |
|---|---|---|---|
| Black | 11 | 7 | 18 |
| White | 2 | 8 | 10 |
| Mexican American | 7 | 2 | 9 |
| Hawaiian | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| Puerto Rican | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| Asian American | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Totals | 20 | 19 | N = 39 |

Source: Hidden Talent Project, Annual Report 1969-70, Sonoma State College, Rohnert Park, California, W. P. Populus, Director, (unpublished Report).

## TABLE II-7

## ETHNIC DISTRIBUTION OF ALL STUDENTS IN THE HIDDEN TALENT PROJECT AT SONOMA STATE COLLEGE AS OF DECEMBER 1969

| | Male | Female | Total | Approx. % of Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Black | 28 | 15 | 43 | 52.4% |
| White | 5 | 12 | 17 | 20.7 |
| Mexican American | 14 | 4 | 18 | 22.0 |
| Hawaiian | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1.2 |
| Puerto Rican | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1.2 |
| Asian American | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2.4 |
| Totals | 48 | 34 | N = 82 | 100.0% |

Source: Compiled from data found in the Hidden Talent Project's Annual Report, 1969-70, Sonoma State College, Rohnert Park, California.

TABLE II-8

A SUMMARY OF THE 82 STUDENTS ENROLLED IN THE HIDDEN TALENT PROJECT AS OF JUNE 1970 AT SONOMA STATE COLLEGE

| | No. of Students | Approx. Percent |
|---|---|---|
| 1. Resigned or withdrew | 5 | 6.1 |
| 2. Graduated (undergraduate degree), June, 1970 | 5 | 6.1 |
| 3. Disqualified | 3 | 3.66 |
| 4. Probation | 9 | 11.0 |
| 5. Not registered, Spring, 1970, only | 3 | 3.66 |
| 6. Active undergraduate enrollment | 57 | 70.0 |
| Totals | N = 82 | 100% |

Source: Hidden Talent Project, 1970, p. 8.

be remembered that all special students were not in the Hidden Talent Project at Sonoma State, but interviewees guessed that almost all were.

As noted in Table II-7, 20 percent of the EOP students were white, 52 percent Black, 22 percent Mexican-American, approximately 1.50 percent each of Asian-Americans and Puerto Ricans. Table II-8 shows that as many students graduated as of June, 1970 as resigned or withdrew. And, of the 82 students enrolled at that time, 57 were active undergraduate students. The dropout rate was only 6.1 percent during this time.

Table II-9 shows a summary of the 82 students enrolled in the Hidden Talent Project as of June, 1970. This table shows the range of financial assistance received ($25.00 to $3,161.00); the range of grade point averages (GPA) earned (.60 to 4.00); and range of units taken for the academic year (.5 to 54).

TABLE II-9

SUMMARY OF HIDDEN TALENT STUDENTS ENROLLED AT SONOMA STATE COLLEGE FOR THE ACADEMIC YEAR 1969-1970

| | Not Participating | Lowest | Highest | Totals |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Total Financial Aid | 11 | $25.00 | $3,161.00 | N = 71 |
| Total G.P.A. | 12 | .60 | 4.00 | N = 70 |
| Units, Fall 69-70 | 10 | .5 | 54 | N = 72 |

Source: Hidden Talent Project, 1970, p. 9.

The column headed "Not Participating" indicates that the student did not receive financial aid and had no G.P.A. or earned units due to withdrawal, probation, resignation, disqualification, or not enrolled Spring, 1970.

4. Graduate Degrees Awarded

During the year 1966-1967, reports from the Office of Admissions and Records indicated that there were 177 baccalaureate degrees and three graduate degrees earned and awarded.[7] While no respondents would estimate the ethnic representation in these classes, it was generally agreed that no Blacks, Browns, American Indians or Asian Americans were represented in these figures.

The academic year 1967-1968 witnessed 230 students earning the baccalaureate degree, and 16 students earned graduate degrees.[8] Again, respondents estimated that none of the American ethnic minority groups identified above were present in these groups. This was particularly significant since the interviewees were each interviewed separately and no respondent knew what any of the other administrators had perceived.

For the school year 1968-1969, the first year of EOP (or the Hidden Talent Project) the reports indicated 416 baccalaureate degrees were awarded.[9] Estimates ranged from one to five of whom were Black Americans; zero to two, Mexican-Americans; one to five, Asian Americans; and two to six for others (interviewees considered "others" as foreign students). It was also estimated that no Chicanos or Blacks, but perhaps one Asian American and one or two other foreign students were included in the twenty graduate degrees issued by the college that year.

---

[7] "Information Service Guide," Sonoma State College (an unpublished report of degrees awarded each year between 1966-1967 through 1970-1971). These figures were broken down by academic year in five categories: 1) number of students earning degrees (B.S. and graduate) at the end of the Summer, Fall, Winter, and Spring quarters, and totals.

[8] Ibid., p. 7.

[9] Ibid., p. 8.

Estimates for earned baccalaureate degrees during 1969-1970 ranged from five to ten Blacks; two to six Chicanos; six to ten Asian Americans, and five to fifteen "others" among those receiving degrees. There were no estimates of the total number of degrees granted, but records showed that 660 were issued for that period.[10]

Reports indicated that forty graduate degrees were awarded by the institution in June, 1970,[11] and it was estimated that one to two were Blacks; one to two were Chicanos; no American Indians, two to three were Asian Americans, and three to seven were "others."

Undergraduate degrees earned during the college year 1970-1971 totaled 761.[12] It was estimated that of this group, ten to twenty were Black; six to fourteen were Mexican-American; ten to twenty were Asian American, ten to fifteen "others." Again, it was estimated that no American Indians were among those graduating.

Records show that 81 graduate degrees were issued by the institution in June, 1970, of which the estimated were as follows for ethnic minorities:

1. Blacks - one to two
2. Mexican-American - two to three

---

[10] Ibid., p. 9.

[11] Ibid., p. 10.

[12] Ibid., p. 10.

3. American Indians - zero
4. Asian Americans - one to three
5. Others (foreign students) - three to six

Table II-10 represents a summary of the estimated undergraduate degrees awarded by the institution between the years 1966-1967 and 1970-1971. Note, this summary of estimates of interviewees only shows the range (high and low number of students) of the various ethnic groups participating in the graduation as degree recipients at Sonoma State College.

### TABLE II-10

### SUMMARY OF PERCEIVED TOTAL UNDERGRADUATE DEGREES AWARDED AT SONOMA STATE COLLEGE BETWEEN 1966-1967 AND 1970-1971

| Ethnic Group | Totals Reported | Estimated Numbers Low | Estimated Numbers High | Estimated Percentages Low | Estimated Percentages High |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 2244 | | | | |
| White | | *2191 | *2118 | *95.2 | *89.1 |
| Black | | 16 | 35 | .7 | 1.5 |
| Mexican American | | 8 | 20 | .4 | .9 |
| American Indian | | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Asian American | | 17 | 35 | .8 | 1.5 |
| Other (foreigners) | | 12 | 36 | .55 | 1.6 |
| **Subtotal | | 53 | 126 | 2.4 | 5.2 |
| Totals | 2244 | 2244 | 2244 | 100.0% | 100.0% |

2244 for total students represent records in the Office of Admissions and Records.

* No estimates made for white students; number represents total degrees not accounted for.

**Total of all groups except white.

Source: Constructed with data gathered with the focused interview questionnaire at Sonoma State College, October, 1971.

As can be noted, the estimates show that from 89 percent to 95 percent of all graduates were white or Euro-American. Also, one will note the high percentage of whites follows the lower percentage of other confined ethnic groups. No estimates were made of the number and percents for white graduates, and the figures used in Table II-10 are compiled from numbers and percents not accounted for.

Respondents also estimated the number of ethnic minorities receiving graduate degrees for the first year period.

Table II-11 represents a summary of the perceived distribution of graduate degrees awarded by the institution between 1966 and 1971. Note the low and high estimates are depicted here in order to show the range in differences of opinions.

While the figures in the foregoing tables represent the estimates compared to actual records, the undergraduate totals for some ethnic groups could be somewhat high or low (Table II-10). The number of racial ethnic minorities who received graduate degrees from this institution could well be estimated a bit high (Table II-11).

Summary

In sum, it can be said that a disproportionate number of ethnic minorities have not earned degrees from Sonoma State College, Rohnert Park, California during the five years ending in June, 1971. Some progress was evident after 1968; however, this was almost insignificant compared with the total progress of the school.

## TABLE II-11

## SUMMARY OF GRADUATE DEGREES AWARDED BY SONOMA STATE COLLEGE BETWEEN 1966-1967 AND 1970-1971 AS PERCEIVED BY THE THREE ADMINISTRATORS INTERVIEWED

| Ethnic Group | Actual Total | Estimates |  | Approximate Percentages |  | Mean |  |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
|  |  | Low | High | Low | High | Numbers | Percentages |
| White |  | *(144) | *(128) | *(90) | *(80) | *(136) | *(85.0%) |
| Black |  | 2 | 5 | 1.85% | 3.1% | 3.5 | 2.2% |
| Mexican-American |  | 3 | 5 | 2.0 | 3.1 | 4.5 | 2.5 |
| American Indian |  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Asian American |  | 4 | 7 | 2.5 | 4.4 | 5.5 | 3.5 |
| Other (Foreigners) |  | 7 | 15 | 4.4 | 9.0 | 10.5 | 6.3 |
| **Subtotals |  | 16 | 32 | 10.0% | 20.0% | 24.0 | 15.0% |
| Actual Total | 160 | 160 | 160 | 100.0% | 100.0% | 160.0 | 100.0% |

* No estimates made for whites; figure indicates all degrees not accounted for.
**Subtotals include all groups except whites.

Actual total represents figure taken from records in the Office of Admissions and Records. "Other" usually indicated foreign students.

Source: Data gathered with the focused interview questionnaire at Sonoma State College, October, 1971.

5. Determinants Preventing the College from Reflecting a Greater Number of Ethnic Minority Individuals

A summary of these determinants disclosed the following factors:

1. Geographic location
2. Traditional standards
3. Transportation
4. Student financing
5. State legislative constraints
6. Student housing

While the above determinants were listed as barriers to equal educational opportunity for ethnic minorities, one respondent suggested that since 1969 the student population mirrors a slightly higher proportion of Blacks, Mexican-Americans and Asian Americans than the population of the six surrounding counties which the college basically serves. This respondent, along with one other, also disagreed with the statement in the California Master Plan for Higher Education which stated that the state college system serves primarily the local geographic area where each is located. In qualifying this disagreement, the respondent stated that since 1968 the college recruited an increasingly greater portion of its students from outside the immediate area, and that Los Angeles County had the second highest number of matriculants in Fall, 1971.

In sum, it should be said that while some respondents felt the college could have done nothing to improve its ability to recruit more persons with ethnic minority identity, others proposed three steps which could help. These were: (1) change state policy, (2) re-evaluate traditional admissions policy, (3) state legislature should declare open admissions.

6. Performance

Question: Using a scale of one to six, how do admissions officers perceive the average performance of Special Admissions students relative to the average performance for General Admissions students from similar socio-economic backgrounds who did not receive special services with respect to the following: Grades earned, progress toward degree requirements, social adjustment, adjustment to academic rigors, dropout rate, and time taken to earn degree? Following is a summation of these perceptions.

A. Grades Earned. All respondents perceived that the grades earned by these two groups were about the same for each of the five-year periods which represented the number three column on a continuum from one to six. One respondent elected to make estimates for the last three years only, 1968-1969 through 1970-1971.

B. Progress Toward Degree Requirements. All respondents except one perceived the special admit student as progressing somewhat slower for each of the five years except 1969-1970 and 1970-1971. One reporter perceived that "specials" would progress somewhat faster than general from similar socio-economic backgrounds during the last two years ending June, 1971.

C. *Social Adjustment*. Each officer interviewed perceived social adjustment of "special admits" to be *about the same* or *somewhat slower* than "general" students from similar socio-economic backgrounds. While some interviewees were ill-at-ease with the concept of social adjustment, qualifying statements suggested that "special admits" encounter some difficulty making the social adjustment during the first one or two years of full-time study at the college campus.

D. *Adjustment to Academic Rigors*. When "special admits" were compared to the regular students from similar socio-economic backgrounds, data revealed that their adjustment to academic rigors was *about the same* as regulars. One educator reported somewhat lower for the year 1968-1969, and stated that little or no services (counseling and tutoring) were provided for the specials that year.

E. *Dropout Rates*. More administrators perceived the dropout rate for the "special admit" to be *about the same* or *somewhat lower* as compared to general students from similar socio-economic backgrounds. Again, one respondent rated "specials" *decidedly higher* for the years 1967-1969, which also coincides with the Hidden Talent Annual Report of 1969-1970, which stated that twenty of sixty-four, or about one-third of the initial "specials," dropped out that year.

F. *Time Taken to Earn Degree*. Each educator rated "special admits" *somewhat longer* or *somewhat shorter* when compared with general students from similar socio-economic backgrounds on time taken to earn degrees. It was noted that no person rated the two groups about the same for any of the five years studied. The qualifying statements were that "specials" tended to stay in school longer and continue with persistence, once given the special services of adequate financing, tutoring, and counseling. Other administrators felt that "specials" were continually slower and less persistent than general students from similar socio-economic backgrounds.

## Summary

In summarizing the perceptions administrators held with respect to the performance of Special students relative to the performance of General students from similar socio-economic backgrounds, it should be said that different respondents had different opinions, but collectively these perceptions clustered about the center of the continuum. Generally, there is very little difference in these performances. Also, the Special students tend to be somewhat slower than others in making the necessary adjustment, but once this is done, Specials tend to perform quite satisfactorily in all the areas where judgments were made.

## Performance

Question: Using a scale of one to six, how to Admissions Officers perceive the average performance for Special Admissions students relative to the average performance for General Admissions students with respect to the following areas of progress: Grades earned, Progress toward degree requirements, Social adjustment, Adjustment to academic rigors, Dropout rate, and Time taken to earn degree?

Summary of Opinion
Special Admission Students Relative to General Admission Students

The opinions of administrators relative to the average performance of special students compared to the average performance of the general student body mirrored a pattern very similar to the one just discussed. Most interviewees rated special admission students as being about the same as general admission students. Several ratings were somewhat lower in the area of progress toward degree requirements and adjustment to academic rigors.

The three most often used qualifying intimations were as follows:

1. Specials stay in school longer while many general students drop out, transfer or tune out society completely.
2. Special students consistently begin slowly and most of the misfits drop out the first year, but those remaining catch up with the generals and surpass them by their senior year.
3. Counseling and tutoring have not been adequate except for one or two years for special students. These years were seen to be the last two years ending June, 1971.

Concludingly, it can be said that "special admits" begin considerably slower than generals, those who are unprepared for the challenge drop out the first year or two, and the remaining students tend to catch up to general students and, in many cases, surpass this group by their senior year. The dropout rate is very high the first year, but falls to a rate decidedly lower than generals by their fourth year, as reported by administrators interviewed at Sonoma State College.

### 7. (Turn-Key Effect) Question

What specific policy and operational changes of the Special Admissions Programs have been incorporated into the General Admissions Policies for the years 1966-1967 through 1970-1971?

When asked if any specific policy or operational procedure of the Special Admissions Programs had been incorporated into the General Admissions Policies, each respondent replied, "Nothing," or "None." They did, however, add that the screening of "special admits" had increased immensely beginning Fall, 1970.

### Other Findings

The time taken to complete the focused interview questionnaire was about one and one-half hours. It should not be completed during one sitting without the insistence of the interviewee.

### Summary of Research Project at Sonoma State

Dr. Carl D. Peterson, Sonoma State College, recently (September, 1971) completed a study at this institution entitled "An Exploratory Analysis of the Development and Achievement of E.O.P. (Equal Opportunity Program) Students." The purpose of his study was to evaluate the utility of information obtained from a variety of standardized tests that might be predictive of college success among students admitted to an E.O.P. program at a California State College. The study examined a variety of predictive tests which included student achievement, vocational interest, and personality traits. Also, those evaluating the study assessed change in the "disadvantaged" student's performance after one year in college.

The fifty-four (54) E.O.P. students participating in the study were tested at the beginning and conclusion of one academic year. The three areas tested were: achievement, vocational interest, and self-image.[13]

Indicated in the results were findings that traditional predictive information (high school grade point average, achievement tests, vocational interest tests and self-image tests) of college applicants cannot be used to predict the college grade point averages of disadvantaged students. It was, however, found that combinations of the above measures were significantly predictive of the number of college units completed by disadvantaged students after one academic year.

Separating the subjects into "successful" and "unsuccessful" E.O.P. students was an arbitrary criterion of academic success based upon college G.P.A. (2.0 or better) and units (24 or more semester) completed.[14] Significant differences in performance between the groups and *within* the groups were noted by the termination of one academic year. These differences were noted in performances on achievement tests, vocational interest tests, and self-image tests.

---

[13] Carl Daniel Peterson, Abstract: An Explanatory Analysis of the Development and Achievement of E.O.P. (Equal Opportunity Program) Students. Rohnert Park, Ca.: Sonoma State College. (Unpublished research document, September, 1971), p. 1.

[14] *Ibid.*, p. 2.

Dr. Peterson found that "successful" E.O.P. students indicated a higher (more positive) initial (pre) self-concept score than those E.O.P. students who were "unsuccessful" in their first year of college. He also noted that "successful" E.O.P. students earned higher post-ACT math scores and greater post-congruency between their vocational personality and major field of study than those students considered "unsuccessful."[15]

Of the sixteen variables tested, the three listed below were significant:

1. Post ACT math score.
2. Pre self-concept score.
3. Post vocational personality and major field congruency score.

Table II-12 shows the significance of variance between pre- and post-scores of unsuccessful and successful groups.

As noted above, the most significant change in performance of E.O.P. students who were *not* successful in college demonstrated diminishing self-concept throughout the academic year.[16]

---

[15] *Ibid.*, pp. 1 and 2.

[16] *Ibid.*, pp. 2 and 3.

TABLE II-12

SIGNIFICANCE OF VARIANCE BETWEEN PRE- AND POST-SCORES OF UNSUCCESSFUL AND SUCCESSFUL GROUPS AT SONOMA STATE COLLEGE, 1971[17]

| Variable | N | Mean Unsuccessful Group | Mean Successful Group | F |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Post-ACT Math Score | 34 | 7.94<br>(17) | 13.58<br>(17) | 6.38*S |
| Pre- Self-Concept Score | 44 | 144.22<br>(23) | 159.35<br>(21) | 4.01* |
| Post Vocational Personality and Major Field Congruency Score | 38 | 3.95 | 5.27 | 5.58** |

* Significant to .01 level of confidence.
** Significant to .05 level of confidence.

Dr. Peterson concluded his research by stating that generally, the E.O.P. student enters college with a low score in the communication arts (reading and writing) and this, plus his achievement, is identified in low initial ACT scores. Whether or not the American College Test is a fair or valid measure of predicted college success is relative (there are indications that portions of the ACT, when combined with several factors, are directly related to college academic success).[18]

---

[17] Ibid., p. 3.

[18] Ibid., p. 2.

However, the study did indicate two variables that are not only predictive of ACT scores but that are capable of performance change themselves. The two variables were self-concept and self-acceptance.[19] The assumption is that if improvement in ACT scores is desired, improving the disadvantaged student's self-image will be associated with improvement of his ACT scores.

Also, the disadvantaged student's self-concept will be concurrent with his success (or lack of success) in college. The implication stresses the importance of the disadvantaged student finding something in his college experience that will help his self-concept improve. Otherwise, he might lose self-concept and the possibility of his success in college will be lessened.

## Chapter Summary

In this chapter we have noted that General Admissions to California State Colleges use the regular admissions criteria which consist primarily of an eligibility index comparing test scores (ACT/SAT) and grades earned in high schools. Special Admits were generally identified as being all student admits whose record did not qualify them for general admissions. The focused interview questionnaire was pretested at Sonoma State College, Rohnert Park, California for reliability and validity, and the choice of this school was in keeping with the purpose of this research.

---

[19] Ibid., p. 3.

A summary of findings indicated that Special Admits did not meet the eligibility index requirements but were expected to have interviews, and four letters of reference in order to gain admission to the undergraduate ranks. A greater portion of special students received financial aid, tutorial help and counseling assistance. Perceptions of administrators were that the tutorial program was most effective with Specials during the last two years ending June, 1971, and Specials had been very active in student government for the academic year 1969-1970.

The ethnic characteristics of the student body began to change slightly after 1968 with the initiation of the Hidden Talent Project (EOP), but this growth was insignificant when compared with the overall growth of the student body in numbers during the five years ending June, 1971.

Administrators perceived that there was little difference overall in the performance of Specials and Generals, but when broken down into portions of the academic career, Specials were seen as being much slower starters than Generals. The dropout rate for Specials was seen as being much higher than for Generals during their freshman year, but it tended to stabilize or equal approximately the same as Generals during the next two years. By their senior year, it was felt that Specials tended to have lower dropout rates and higher grade point averages than the General Admissions student.

Interviewees reported no change in the General Admissions Policies as a result of Special Admissions Programs for the five years studied. Chapters III through VI will treat the results of data gathered in the four institutions of higher learning comprising the basic study.

# CHAPTER III

## GENERAL ADMISSIONS POLICIES AND SPECIAL ADMISSIONS PROGRAMS

This chapter will treat the concepts of general and special admissions, an EOP student, implications for special admissions programs and a summary of findings relative to policies waived for the special student in the institutions studied.

### General Admissions Policies

General Admissions Policies in colleges and universities are basically those policies which are designed to limit, select or deselect students to their undergraduate student ranks. Colleges and universities which do not practice "Open Admissions" can be said to have such policies. In this study, general admissions are synonymous with selective admissions and includes all senior colleges and universities' admissions policies which are not specifically labelled "Special Admissions."

One example of general or selective admissions can be represented using a study by Alexander W. Astin, Director of the Office of Research of the American Council on Education. Mr. Astin states: "Although there can be minor variations from year to year, institutional selectivity tends to be a highly stable institutional trait."[1] Mr.

---

[1] Alexander W. Astin, "Open Admissions and Programs for the Disadvantaged," Journal of Higher Education, Vol. 42, No. 8 (November, 1971), p. 632.

Astin also suggested that selectivity is highly correlated with an institution's prestige, including variables such as faculty salaries, endowment, research contract funds, faculty student ratio, size of library, academic competitiveness among students and the political orientation of the school.[2] Table III-1 shows how the population of institutions was distributed with respect to selectivity in 1968.

TABLE III-1

SELECTIVITY LEVELS OF HIGHER EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS, 1968
(N = 2,319)**

| College Selectivity Level | Corresponding Range of Student Mean Scores | | Institutions | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | SAT V+M | ACT Composite | No. | Pct. |
| 8........... | 1320 or higher | 30 or higher | 27 | 1.2 |
| 7........... | 1236-1319 | 28-29 | 43 | 1.8 |
| 6........... | 1154-1235 | 26-27 | 85 | 3.7 |
| 5........... | 1075-1153 | 25-26 | 141 | 6.1 |
| 4........... | 998-1074 | 23-24 | 342 | 14.7 |
| 3........... | 926- 997 | 21-22 | 331 | 14.3 |
| 2........... | 855- 925 | 19-20 | 273 | 11.8 |
| 1........... | 854 or lower | 18 or lower | 281 | 12.1 |
| No estimate available.. | 854* | 19* | 796 | 34.3 |

Note: Table includes all institutions listed in part 3 of the 1968 edition of the U.S. Office of Education's Education Directory, except those institutions that require prior undergraduate credits for admission.

*Estimate of the average test scores of students entering institutions in this category, based on evidence reported in Alexander W. Astin, Predicting Academic Performance in College (New York: Free Press, 1971).

**Taken from Alexander W. Astin, "Open Admissions and Programs for the Disadvantaged," Journal of Higher Education, Vol. 42, No. 8 (November, 1971), p. 632.

---

[2] Ibid.

These figures included all institutions listed in part 3 of the 1968 edition of the U.S. Office of Education's Education Directory, except those institutions which require prior undergraduate credits for admission.

As noted earlier, the State of California has established policy for admissions to state colleges and the university system with the Master Plan, which decreed that the university may accept the top 12 percent and the state colleges the top 33 percent of the state's yearly high school graduating classes.

Since this study focuses on the perceptions of Admissions officers, we note what David E. Hooten found in a recent dissertation study:

> The position of Director of Admissions and the admissions office and function are not highly influential in charting the courses of institutions. They are dedicated to the fulfillment of policies established elsewhere without significant influence from admissions personnel and to the performance of routine, clerically oriented, traditional functions.[3]

Thus, we note that General Admissions policies tend to be very important to public institutions of higher education, and are established by state governing bodies in California. Also, the policies leave Admissions officers with little or no flexibility in determining who and what kinds of students are permitted to matriculate at their respective institutions.

## Special Admissions Programs

Special Admissions programs include those programs so labeled and are sometimes called "excepted admissions," "special projects," or simply "specials." These include all non-regular admits which allow for or provide some form of "special" opportunity for "non-traditional college type" students to gain entrance to the college.

---

[3] David E. Hooten, "Th Admissions Function in Public Urban Colleges and Universities," College and University, The Journal of the American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers, Washington, D.C., Vol. 47, No. 1 (Fall, 1971), p. 65.

During a recent interview with Rick Turner, Assistant Director of Admissions, Stanford University, he stated that the purpose of Special Admissions and Special Admit projects was to try and identify factors which could be used to extend the General Admissions criteria.

## Developmental Concepts of an EOP Student; Open Admissions

Federal City College in Washington, D.C., serving a community largely populated with Blacks, represents one of the first colleges to use Open Admissions from its beginning in modern times. Open enrollment is also being tried at Rutgers University and at the City University of New York.[4]

## City University of New York

September, 1970 ushered into the City University of New York (CUNY) the initiation of a concept long shared by a few, and which recently became a more equitable means of expanding educational opportunity. The policy of Open Admissions in effect dispensed with all traditional competitive admissions requirements and enabled students with a high school diploma or its equivalent to enroll in each of the sixteen units of the City University. Such a step affected thousands of high school students who would not have met the competitive requirements previously demanded by the City University. These students were permitted to matriculate and were provided with an opportunity to continue their education.

---

[4] Amitai Etzioni and Irene Tinker, "A Sociological Perspective on Black Studies," in Charles Dobbins (ed.), Educational Record, Vol. 52, No. 1 (Washington, D.C.: The American Council on Education, Winter, 1971), p. 65.

## Critics of Open Admissions

Two widely divergent schools of thought have emerged with the Open Admissions issue. In one camp is the feeling that the opportunity to attend college on a full-time basis carries with it a responsibility for the student to enroll in 12-17 credits per semester. The opposite camp recommends that students with less than 75 high school average enroll in only noncredit courses during the first two semesters.

Critics such as Vice President Spiro T. Agnew, B. S. Hollinshead and Steven Y. Tonser would advise against an "open door policy." Some fear the deterioration of academic standards and the shifting of responsibility for the basic skills from the secondary schools to the colleges. Many secondary and elementary school teachers would probably offer in rebuttal that which they have come to accept as an educational philosophy: "Accept the student as he is." Other critics foresee a "revolving door" at the university, with great hoards of students entering and "failing" to make the necessary "academic adjustments."

## Research on CUNY

A recent study conducted by Dr. Robert Birnbaum, Director of City University of New York's Office for Research in Higher Education, and Joseph Goldman of the University's Center for Social Research, resulted in some important findings. The findings, based upon returned

131

questionnaires from 7,839 graduates of the city high schools in 1970, whose responses were projected to estimate the educational activity of all 1970 city high school graduates, reflected the following:

1. Seventy-six (76%) percent of the city's 68,400 high school graduates of 1970 went to some form of full time higher education. The figure compared to 57% from 1969 and 55% to 60% on a national level, and also was attributed to open admission which began in the fall of 1970.

2. Only 10% of the city's 1970 high school graduating class with a grade average of at least 80 were Black, Latin American or Puerto Rican, despite the fact that these ethnic groups comprise 26% of all graduates.

3. Public academic schools lost 37% of their students between December of their junior year and graduation, while public vocational schools lost 40% during the same period.

4. In public academic high schools, Black and Puerto Rican juniors were twice as likely not to graduate the next year as whites.

5. Fifty-eight percent of all nonpublic high school graduates had academic averages of at least 80, compared with 39% of public academic high school graduates and 20% of public vocational graduates. Only 3% of the nonpublic graduates earned grades under 70 percent, while almost 20% of all public school graduates did.

6. Of the city's 1970 high school graduating class, the ethnic group most likely to attend college full time were the Orientals (88%), followed by whites (78%), Blacks (67%), Latin Americans (67%) and Puerto Ricans (63%).

7. Family income is related to the type of high school a student attended, with 39% of public academic high school graduating from families earning at least $10,000 per year, compared with 11% at public vocational schools and 42% at nonpublic schools.

8. Sixty-five (65%) percent of students with family incomes of less than $3,700 went to college compared with 89% of those whose families earned incomes over

> $15,000. Sixty-nine percent of the financially poorer students listed the City University as their first choice, compared with 44% of those from families in the $15,000 plus income bracket.[5]

Two sociologists, Walter Adams and Abram Jaffie of Columbia Bureau of Applied Social Research, expressed concerns about Open Admissions in American colleges and universities in a report made public in December, 1970, while attending the Allied Social Science Association's convention in Detroit. They suggested that "the advocates of more open enrollment in college must face the no doubt unpleasant possibility that the college careers of many, perhaps most, of the target students would be brief." These scholars were particularly concerned with projected high drop-out rates, and felt that harm could come to students and colleges unless recognition were given to this factor and effective measures taken to assure continuation. These authors would expect nearly half of the students to drop out within a few years, and concluded that equalitarian impulse alone is insufficient justification for radical change in higher learning, and that open enrollment should stand or fall on the basis of demonstrable effects upon colleges and students. They urged that future programs be limited in scope and accompanied by constant evaluation.[6]

---

[5] Andrew H. Malcolm, "City Finds a Jump in College-Bound," New York Times (May 11, 1971).

[6] Gene Currivan, "Sociologists Warm on Open Enrolling," New York Times (December 30, 1970).

In late March, 1971, M. A. Farber, in an article entitled "City University Faces Rise in New Freshmen," cited both positive and negative challenges of Open Admissions, but the article stated categorically that Open Admissions programs were fairly successful. The article stated that after more than six months of Open Admissions, preliminary estimates by the City University indicated that the percentage of day freshmen who dropped out after the first semester was 10.8 percent of a class of 34,500 students--slightly less than the 12 percent in the fall of 1969, and 11.2 percent in 1968 (the last two years of restricted enrollment).

While the drop-out rate could be considered a plus, the challenges cited by the article included the lack of sufficient financing, the need for continued remedial programs, the problem of sheer space on campus to accommodate great numbers, loneliness and the need for continued counseling of opportunity students.

In summing up the start of 1970, the President of Brooklyn College said, "I thought we'd have more difficulty in enrolling so many more students, organizing so many more classes and hiring so many new faculty. I thought there would be more confusion, which is not to say that everything is hunky dory."[7] In this article Dr. William M. Birenbaum, President of Staten Island Community College, was quoted as saying, "Granted, we are doing the best we can, everything is inadequate. It's much too early to tell whether the best we are doing is good enough."

---

[7] Leonard Buder, "Open Admissions Policy Taxes City U. Resources," New York Times (October 12, 1970).

While the effectiveness of Open Admissions awaits longitudinal studies, some early returns are evident. Herbert H. Lehman College, one of the four-year senior colleges of CUNY with Open Admissions, was recently researched by Jeanette Ann Benjamin and Philip Edward Powell after the first semester in college. As members of the counseling staff in the office of the dean of students at the Bronx location, these educators were directly involved in this effort.

Lehman College's fall 1970 freshman class consisted of 2,417 students of which 2,054 were regularly admitted students (freshmen in special programs such as SEEK were not included). Table III-2 below indicates that of these 2,054 students, 1,145 or 56 percent of the class had less than an 80 high school average.[8]

TABLE III-2

NUMBER OF LEHMAN COLLEGE FRESHMEN, FALL 1970:
A COMPARISON BY HIGH SCHOOL AVERAGES*

| High School Averages | Number | Per Cent of Class |
|---|---|---|
| 85.0 and above | 356 | 17 |
| 80.0 to 84.9 | 553 | 27 |
| 75.0 to 79.9 | 741 | 36 |
| 70.0 to 74.9 | 298 | 15 |
| 69.0 and below | 196 | 5 |
|  | 2,054 | 100% |

*Benjamin, J. A. and Powell, P. E., "Open Admissions: Expanding Educational Opportunity," Journal of the National Association of Women Deans and Counselors, Vol. 34, No. 4 (Summer, 1971), p. 146.

---

[8] J. A. Benjamin and P. E. Powell, "Open Admissions: Expanding Educational Opportunity," Journal of the National Association of Women Deans and Counselors, Vol. 34, No. 4 (Summer, 1971), 146.

This means that before Open Admissions, these students would not have been eligible for admission to a senior college of the City University.

## Summary

In summarizing Open Admissions, it should be said that different scholars have varying opinions about the feasibility and practicality of open enrollment. With Open Admissions at Federal City College, Rutgers, and CUNY, reports indicate that a significant number of traditional non-college types should have the opportunity to earn a higher education. It seems also that the New York system with all its magnitude of effort has apparently been able to weather the storm and has realized less severe problems in the academic process than many administrators predicted. In the California State College System, the concept of an EOP student has been defined with different specific connotations, and it is to this subject that I now turn.

## Concepts of an EOP Student in California

The State of California has constantly labored to define an EOP student since 1969. Several of these working definitions should be considered.

The Budget Act of 1969 restricted the number of EOP students to 3,150. Since regularly admissible students did not require the assistance of EOP to become a student, the Chancellor's Office memo of July 17, 1969 defined an EOP student.

> Existing working definitions vary from college to college. In some instances only "exception" admissions are included. In other cases a portion of

> EOP enrollees have been drawn from among those students meeting regular eligibility admissions requirements. For our present purposes EOP students are those who do not meet regular admissions requirements and who are enrolled in a special program involving some combination of tutoring, advising and counseling. At the option of each college, additional students may be involved in program activities. However, they have not been utilized in terminating budget allocations and they are not being reported as bonafide EOP enrollees.[9]

The above definition was short-lived. By September, 1969, SB 1072, the State College Educational Opportunity Program, was signed into law. Though this act referred primarily to recipients of the EOP grants provided in the Budget Act, it defined an EOP student as one selected by the Trustees:

> . . . from those nominated by each high school in the state, the Veteran's Administration and state agencies authorized to nominate candidates for participation in such programs, but requires such students to meet the standards of the State College which they are attending or the requirement for the special admission program established by the Trustees.[10]

One report, The Educational Opportunity Program for San Francisco State College, 1970, set forth the definition below of EOP students:

1. All EOP students must be residents of the State of California. This is required for fee purposes and not related to voting privileges.

2. If the student is applying as a first-time freshman, he must be academically ineligible for regular admissions (Title 5, paragraphs 40750 through 40758).

3. If a student is applying as a transfer student, he

---

[9] "What is an EOP Student," EOP Newsletter, Vol. 2, No. 4 (San Francisco State College, December, 1970), p. 8.

[10] Ibid., p. 8.

must have completed less than 60 semester units and be academically ineligible for regular admission (Title 5, paragraphs 40800 through 40806).

4. A student who is academically eligible for admission is not eligible for admission under the EOP program.

5. Admission under the EOP does not necessarily mean financial support. A student whose only need is financial, but meets the standard college admission requirements, is ineligible for admission under EOP.

The Coordinating Council for Higher Education (State of California) reported in April, 1971, the following definitions of an EOP student on pages 18 and 19 of their report:

On the College Campus

For purposes of the state-funded program, an EOP student is defined as follows: 1) He is an individual who has the potential to perform satisfactorily on the college level, but who has been unable to realize that potential because of economic, cultural, or educational background or environment; 2) He is expected to participate in the full range of services provided by the program (in contrast to the individual who may be provided minimal assistance from time to time, but who is not continuously enrolled in the program); 3) He is eligible for admission only under "special" procedures (Title 5, Sections 40759, 40807) or meets regular admissions requirements but in the opinion of the college is only "technically" eligible and will require full assistance in order to succeed; 4) He is an undergraduate student.

The intent of the above definitions was to provide a consistent base for counting and reporting. It was not, however, intended to prohibit helping students who were enrolled at the colleges and subsequently encountered difficulties which EOP could overcome with sufficient assistance. It was expected that the number of regularly eligible students enrolled in EOP would represent a relatively small proportion of the total, so long as available resources were considerably short of funds.[11]

University

An Educational Opportunity Program student is defined as a student who is formally admitted to the Educational Opportunity Program by the Director of the Educational Opportunity Program on his campus and who, upon being admitted to that program, requires one or more of the services available to EOP students, including (a) admission by special action, (b) tutoring and retentive services, (c) counseling services provided by the EOP and (d) financial aid.[12]

In October 1971, a pamphlet at San Francisco State College delineated the EOP as being a program designed to help students from low income families who are educationally, culturally, or economically disadvantaged, but who have the potential for achieving a higher education through special services which includes a combination of tutoring, advising and counseling.

In this meaning, it was noted that the words "minority background" were not used or included in the description of disadvantaged students. "Minority background" does not necessarily characterize disadvantaged students--many Black, Brown, Red and Yellow families live in the various middle class neighborhoods, and in many cases their children complete their education in private high schools and colleges. EOP includes students from all races, creeds, and colors.

---

[11] "Regulations and Recommendations 1970-1971," The State College Chancellor's Office (State of California, Los Angeles, Ca.: July, 1970).

[12] "Report on the University of California Undergraduate Educational Opportunity Program for Academic Year 1969-1970." Unpublished document. (California State Colleges, Los Angeles, Ca.: January, 1971.)

Summarizing

In summarizing the developmental concepts of an EOP student, one can realize that shades of meaning have progressed from an individual college's interpretation of "Specials" to a student with a broad background profile who only has need of some portion of the special services offered. According to the interviewees, the state, in their effort to limit the number and kinds of students enrolling, has consistently put more pressure on directors to recruit only those persons who meet regular admissions requirements but are poverty stricken. In some institutions, the anxiety and frustration level had been heightened by what they felt was a concrete effort to limit the numbers of ethnic minorities enrolling in these institutions.

It was noted, during the data-gathering phase of this research, that at least one person at each institution suggested that faculties at the colleges and universities need readjustments as much as minority students to the integrated campus. Areas cited in which these readjustments are needed included:

1. Attitudes towards ethnic minority students.
2. Concept about EOP and admissions policies.

3. The ability to communicate with the minority student.
4. Grading policies and practices.
5. The faculty's concept of what constitutes academic legitimacy.

Here it can be realized that the student who has been systematically shut out from full participation in higher education is not alone in his alienation and shortcomings. And, indeed, it is the faculty who need a reeducation relative to the concepts and attitudes listed above.

## Analysis of Findings

### Identification of Institutions

These are the institutions used in this study:

"A" -- San Jose State College, San Jose, California
"B" -- California State College, Hayward, California
"C" -- San Francisco State College, San Francisco, California
"D" -- University of California, Berkeley, California

### Responses

Institution "A". All respondents perceived the following requirements with respect to General Admissions students:

1. They must take the SAT or ACT test, and
2. Have earned at least 2.0 GPA for all first year college freshmen.
3. They must qualify on the eligibility index table.

The three items above were waived for Special Admissions students;

however, "Special" students were expected to secure letters of reference, including character references, a reference from the student's former high school, and a letter from a former counselor.

Each interviewee suggested that "specials needed two or three letters of reference," and one cited Senate Bill 1072, 1969, as requiring a letter of reference for all "special" admissions students.

Institution "B". As noticed in Institution "A," all interviewees perceived the three factors above as being requirements for General Admissions students. Also, each agreed that special admits did not meet the general requirements. These three requirements were waived for specials. The responses were evenly split on whether or not specials needed at least one character reference and a letter from his former high school. One respondent perceived that no reference letters were required for specials. Personal interviews were perceived as being important for specials to gain admission, but not required. There was also a split opinion regarding whether or not work experience or extracurricular activities played an important part for specials in gaining admission to the college.

Institution "C". General admissions students were perceived as required only to meet the eligibility index criteria by all respondents. This eligibility index requirement was waived for all special admits through 1969, but beginning in 1970, opinions were that more specials were meeting the eligibility index but were poverty stricken. This, according to the respondents, was due to the fact of overcrowding, and a large number of what would be general admits entered through the special admissions door. One administrator stated clearly that the school did not use nearly all their "slots" for special admissions. He did not elaborate. No interviewee felt that extracurricular activities were important for specials, but two of the five persons interviewed opined that work experience was a solid positive plus factor for specials. Reference letters and interviews were perceived to be very important for specials by one administrator, important by two administrators, and not very important by two administrators. Character reference was seen as being very important by one interviewee, and important by two respondents for specials.

Institution "D". Each respondent perceived that the 3.0 GPA, the top 12 percent of high school graduating classes and scores on the ACT were waived for special students. Generals were only required to meet test scores, grades and rank in class factors for admission. Two of the four respondents perceived that a significant number of specials did meet the grade requirement, and some met the test score barrier. Work experience was not seen as an important factor for specials; neither was extracurricular activities in high school. Only for athletics, reported two respondents, when asked if extracurricular activities were important for specials. Only one administrator felt that interviews were important for specials, and one each were of the opinion that letters of reference were important and very important for excepted admissions.

## Summary of Comparative (Institutional) Perceptions

This general question made up part one of the six-part interview questionnaire. It was noted that, of the 19 subset questions contained in part one, several items were not directly related to the admissions criteria. These were:

1. work experience prior to entering college,
2. extracurricular activities in high school,
3. personal interview with prospective students,
4. proof of student's financial stability.

It was learned that these four items were not required; however, some respondents suggested that items 1, 2, and 3 were encouraged for special admits, and each item was important in sometimes securing admission.

## Similarities

While proof of a student's financial stability was not required for admission, all respondents in each institution estimated that the parents' confidential statement or their signature was required for all students seeking financial aid.

Other items used often and having importance in gaining admission for "Special" students, but not used for "General" students, in the several institutions (and not seen by all respondents), were:

1. Letters of reference, including a character reference, a reference from the student's former high school, and a letter from a former counselor.

Each interviewee suggested that "Specials" needed one, two, or three letters of reference, and one cited Senate Bill 1072 as requiring a letter of reference for all "Special" Admissions students.

High on the list of General Admissions requirements were grades, test scores and rank in class. However, opinions were usually split about 50-50 on whether or not rank in class was a determinant in being accepted for college study. It was generally agreed that the eligibility index of GPA and test scores were the two primary determinants for "General" students. These three determinants were not very important for "Special" admits.

Traditional criteria for admission were waived for "Special" students in all the institutions; while each school was allowed two percent, plus two percent for undergraduate special students, these numbers were divided into several pieces of which EOP was the largest single competitive. One institution reported that they did not use all their four percent spaces for special admits, but declined to explain the statement except to say that their college had about 15 to 20 different Special Admission Programs. As on the other campuses, these groups included the several academic departments, EOP, Athletics, Step Up, Upward Bound, and others.

In sum, at Institutions "A," "B," "C," and "D," General Admission policies waived for Special Admissions Students tended to be a tradeoff, where "specials" traded lack of high test scores and a GPA of 2.0 (or 3.0 in the University) or better for good character references and overall evidence of leadership ability as evidenced through interviews, work experience, and extracurricular activities.

By comparison, Institutions "B" and "C" were not significantly different from Institution "A" in their admission criteria. In each school, the administration perceived the eligibility index of GPA and test scores as being the primary criteria for General Admissions students.

Special Admissions students were identified as being all students who did not qualify academically for regular admissions to the study of higher education based upon the eligibility index.

## Differences in (Perceptions) the Four Schools

While there was little or no significant difference between the state colleges, there were minor differences which were evidenced by the degree of importance attached to the work record, letters of reference and extracurricular activities experienced by SAS. Institution "A" placed high importance on the written autobiography of SAS, while Institution "B" placed emphasis on written references and grades. Institution "C" tended to emphasize more the subjective opinions of college administrators or other personnel who conducted the interviews of prospective SAS (Special Admissions Students).

There was one university in the study which placed high value on grades and test scores. Institution "D" differed from the others in that it required a 3.0 or better GPA, required specific courses as high school preparation, and three achievement scores on the Scholastic Aptitude Test, as perceived by the interviewees.

Table III-3 shows some differences in requirements for GAS and

## TABLE III-3

## COMPARATIVE DIFFERENCES IN REQUIREMENTS FOR GENERAL ADMISSIONS AND SPECIAL ADMISSIONS STUDENTS IN FOUR INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION AS PERCEIVED BY INTERVIEWEES (1966-1967 THROUGH 1970-1971)

| Institution | Eligibility Index Required |  | Lowest GPA |  | Rank in High School Graduating Class |  | Reference Letters Recommended |  | Interviews Recommended |  | Written Autobiography Recommended |  |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
|  | GAS | SAS | GAS | SAS | GAS | SAS | GAS | SAS | GAS | SAS | GAS | SAS |
| Institution "A" | Yes | No | 2.0 | None | 33-1/3% | None | No | Yes | No | Yes | No | Yes |
| Institution "B" | Yes | No | 2.0 | None | 33-1/3% | None | No | Yes | No | Yes | No | Yes |
| Institution "C" | Yes | No | 2.0 | None | 33-1/3% | None | No | Yes | No | Yes | No | Yes |
| Institution "D" | Yes | No | 3.0 | None | 12-1/2% | None | No | Yes | No | Yes | No | Yes |

Source: Gathered with part one of the focused interview questionnaire, October and November, 1971.

SAS in the four institutions, as perceived by those interviewed.

EOP-type programs were initiated in Institutions "A" and "B" in 1968, at Institution "C" in 1967 ("Step" and "Upward Bound"), and at Institution "D" in 1966.

Summary of Reports

Relevant reports were not available in each institution; however, Table III-4 represents a comparison of class and entry status at Institution "A" for Fall, 1968, which marked the beginning of the EOP in this institution.

TABLE III-4

COMPARISON OF CLASS AND ENTRY STATUS BETWEEN BLACK AND CHICANO EOP STUDENTS AT SAN JOSE STATE COLLEGE, FALL 1968[13]

| | Black | | Chicano | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | N | % | N | % |
| Freshmen | 120 | 60 | 138 | 56 |
| Transfer Freshmen | 28 | 14 | 61 | 25 |
| Transfer Sophomores | 30 | 15 | 19 | 8 |
| Transfer Juniors | 22 | 11 | 29 | 11 |
| | 200 | 100% | 247 | 100% |
| | N | % | N | % |
| Regularly admitted | 37 | 19 | 110 | 45 |
| Specially admitted | 163 | 81 | 137 | 55 |
| | 200 | 100% | 247 | 100% |

---

[13] Ad Hoc Committee, Report on Evaluation of EOP. An Unpublished Report. (San Jose, Ca.: San Jose State College, 1968-1969), pp. 41-42.

As noted in Table III-4, most of the students in each section are freshmen; 60 percent of the Black students and 56 percent of the Chicanos. Special Admits included 81 percent of the Black students but only 55 percent of the Chicanos. It can be observed that a significantly high percentage of both groups (19 percent Blacks and 45 percent Chicanos) were admitted as regular students. A summary of findings by the Ad Hoc Committee at San Jose State suggested that those Special Admissions students in EOP were there only to receive financial aid or other services.[14]

Table III-5 shows a comparison of academic status between Black and Chicano EOP students during the fall and spring quarters, 1968-1969. This table demonstrates that only two percent of the Black and three percent of the Chicano students in the EOP programs were disqualified during fall, 1968. Seventy-one percent of the Black and 47 percent of the Chicano students were clear, and 24 percent of the Black plus 44 percent of the Chicano students were on probation for the same period.

When comparing fall records with Spring 1969, we note that the percentage of Blacks on probation dropped from 24 percent to 14 percent and Chicanos from 44 percent to 30 percent. Students with clear records rose from 71 percent to 75 percent for Blacks and from 47 percent to 60 percent for Chicanos. The percentages for disqualification, however, went up from two percent to six percent for Blacks, and from three percent to seven percent for Chicano students. The evaluation report labeled both programs (Black and Chicano) successful, and recommended further research on this and all EOP programs. No relative reports

---

[14] Ibid., p. 4.

## TABLE III-5

## COMPARISON OF ACADEMIC STATUS BETWEEN BLACK AND CHICANO EOP STUDENTS, FALL AND SPRING SEMESTER, 1968-1969 SAN JOSE STATE COLLEGE[15]

---

### FALL 1968

| | Black | | Chicano | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | N | % | N | % |
| Clear | 143 | 71 | 115 | 47 |
| Withdrew | 6 | 3 | 16 | 6 |
| Probation | 48 | 24 | 109 | 44 |
| Disqualified | 3 | 2 | 7 | 3 |
| | 200 | 100% | 247 | 100% |

### SPRING 1969

| | Black | | Chicano | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | N | % | N | % |
| Clear | 152 | 75 | 135 | 60 |
| Withdrew | 10 | 5 | 6 | 3 |
| Probation | 29 | 14 | 67 | 30 |
| Disqualified | 12 | 6 | 15 | 7 |
| | 203 | 100% | 223 | 100% |

---

[15] *Ibid.*, p. 42.

are available for GAS, however, so such a comparison cannot be made.

Other Reports

California Coordinating Council of Higher Education conducted a survey in the Fall of 1967 to obtain data on the use of the "two percent exception rule." Data were collected to determine the extent of the use of the exception clause, the relationship to programs for "disadvantaged" students. Tables III-6 and III-7 show the use of the two percent rule for first-time freshmen, Fall 1966 and Fall 1967.

First-Time Freshmen

> During the Fall of 1966, 24,014 first-time freshmen were offered admission to the California State colleges. Among them were 333 who did not meet established minimum eligibility requirements. Two hundred and sixty-one of this number, or 1.1 percent of all freshmen admissions, actually enrolled. Reported use of "exception" admissions in conjunction with programs for the "disadvantaged" was minimal, totalling 65 throughout the system. However, it should be noted that several colleges were unable to provide this data since available records were not in all cases so classified.[16]

Table III-6 provides a college-by-college breakdown of the above information.

In the Fall of 1967, 26,682 freshmen were admitted; an increase of 11 percent over the previous Fall. About 482 failed to meet minimum eligibility standards. Four hundred twenty-five of this number, or 1.6 percent of all freshmen admissions, actually enrolled. This represented

---

[16] Coordinating Council for Higher Education, "Preliminary Report on Use of Two Percent Exception Provisions in the California State Colleges, Fall, 1966, Fall, 1967." Unpublished Report (Los Angeles, CA: California State Colleges, 1967), p. 1.

## TABLE III-6

## USE OF TWO PERCENT RULE FOR FIRST-TIME FRESHMEN, FALL 1966* IN THE CALIFORNIA STATE COLLEGES[17]

| College | Freshmen Admitted | Freshmen Exceptions Admitted | Freshmen Exceptions Enrolled | | Disadvantaged Exceptions Admitted** |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | # | % | |
| Dominguez Hills | 40 | 1 | 1 | 2.5 | -0- |
| Fullerton | 1235 | 2 | 2 | .2 | -0- |
| Hayward | 1108 | 57 | 37 | 3.3 | 42 |
| Long Beach | 2479 | 11 | 11 | .4 | -0- |
| Los Angeles | 1195 | 25 | 22 | 1.8 | -0- |
| San Bernardino | 169 | 1 | -0- | -0- | -0- |
| Cal Poly KV | 1065 | 48 | 38 | 3.6 | 4 |
| Cal Poly SLO | 1829 | 17 | 14 | .8 | -0- |
| Chico | 1375 | 26 | 21 | 1.5 | -0- |
| Fresno | 1102 | 13 | 11 | 1.0 | -0- |
| Humboldt | 805 | 7 | 6 | .7 | -0- |
| Sacramento | 1283 | 16 | 12 | .9 | -0- |
| San Diego | 2450 | -0- | -0- | -0- | -0- |
| San Fernando Val. | 1760 | 14 | 12 | .7 | 1 |
| San Francisco | 2262 | 25 | 20 | .9 | 18 |
| San Jose | 3541 | 64 | 49 | 1.4 | -0- |
| Sonoma | 221 | 3 | 3 | 1.4 | -0- |
| Stanislaus | 95 | 2 | 2 | 2.1 | -0- |
| SYSTEMWIDE | 24,014 | 333 | 261 | 1.1 | 65 |

* Adult specials excluded in accordance with policy in effect prior to Fall, 1967.

** Includes only those students specifically identified and admitted as part of a program for the disadvantaged. Data on number actually enrolled is not available, but probably is only slightly less than the number admitted.

---

[17] *Ibid.*, p. 3.

### TABLE III-7

### USE OF TWO PERCENT RULE FOR FIRST-TIME FRESHMEN, FALL 1967* IN CALIFORNIA STATE COLLEGES[18]

| College | Freshmen Admitted | Freshmen Exceptions Admitted | Freshmen Exceptions Enrolled | | Disadvantaged Exceptions Admitted** |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | # | % | |
| Dominguez Hills | 149 | 9 | 5 | 3.3 | -0- |
| Fullerton | 1582 | 6 | 6 | .4 | 3 |
| Hayward | 1238 | 69 | 61 | 4.9 | 53 |
| Long Beach | 2497 | 63 | 61 | 2.4 | 47 |
| Los Angeles | 1234 | 23 | 19 | 1.5 | 3 |
| San Bernardino | 270 | 4 | 4 | 1.5 | 1 |
| Cal Poly KV | 1026 | 38 | 29 | 2.8 | -0- |
| Cal Poly SLO | 1992 | 14 | 11 | .6 | -0- |
| Chico | 1578 | 26 | 21 | 1.3 | 10 |
| Fresno | 1211 | 19 | 19 | 1.6 | 17 |
| Humboldt | 959 | 9 | 7 | .7 | -0- |
| Sacramento | 1327 | 35 | 29 | 2.2 | 5 |
| San Diego | 2800 | 25 | 25 | .9 | 25 |
| San Fernando Val. | 2271 | 13 | 10 | .4 | 7 |
| San Francisco | 2110 | 34 | 31 | 1.5 | 29 |
| San Jose | 4026 | 92 | 78 | 1.9 | 23 |
| Sonoma (sample) | 263 | 7 | 5 | 1.9 | 2 |
| Stanislaus | 149 | 4 | 4 | 2.7 | 1 |
| SYSTEMWIDE | 26,682 | 482 | 425 | 1.6 | 226 |

* Adult specials were excluded in order to make 1966 and 1967 data comparable. However, the total number admitted, although not yet available, is believed to be extremely small.

** Includes only those specifically identified and admitted to programs for the disadvantaged.

---

[18] Ibid., p. 6.

an increase of 64 percent over 1966; chiefly as a result of the launching of several programs for the disadvantaged and a widespread recognition of the need for immediate action, even if on a limited basis. The admission of 226 students in conjunction with programs for the disadvantaged represented a nearly four-fold increase.[19] Table III-7 provides a college breakdown of this information.

The foregoing tables tell a brief story about the quantity of initial effort with respect to the use of the two percent exception admissions. It was interesting to note that the report ended with the recommendations listed below.

### Recommendations For Further Study

1. Study the advisability of reducing the cut-off point for lower division exceptions from 60 to 56 semester units.
2. Conduct a study of applicants who barely meet minimum eligibility requirements to determine the advisability of reducing the "regularly eligible" group and establishing an alternative procedure for selecting a portion of the "upper one-third" that would allow for subjective judgment if it significantly increases predictability of success.
3. Devise systematic means for continuing to gather information on "exceptions," particularly those classified as "disadvantaged."
4. Consider desirability of deleting specific quantitative limits on "exception" admissions and substituting principles governing such admission programs.[20]

Mr. Robert Bern, Director of Special Projects, Academic Affairs,

---

[19] _Ibid._, p. 2.

[20] _Ibid._, p. 7.

California State College, and Kenneth S. Washington, Assistant Dean, Student Affairs, California State Colleges, in 1969 stated three important factors about special admits.

They stated that in Fall 1968, 75 percent of EOP admittees were enrolled as "exceptions." In the Fall of 1969, in view of the substantial difference between the numbers of EOP applicants judged worthy of admission and the reduced EOP enrollment ceilings made operative after adoption of the budget, most colleges limited EOP enrollment to so-called "special admits." Those were exceptions and a small number of upper division probation admits. While exact figures are not yet available, it was to be said that essentially all EOP enrollees were admitted by other than the regular criteria.[21]

The second item discussed by Bess and Washington was the selective nature of four year institutions which appeared to represent a hurdle of sufficient height to screen out those prospective students with inadequate motivation.

They also suggested with regards to admission, that

> Once the student decides he wants to attempt further education, he must make a solid case for himself. Selection procedures include interviews, recommendations and autobiographical statements as well as examination of academic strengths and weaknesses. The number selected is significantly lower than the number persisting through the application process.[22]

---

[21] Robert O. Bess and Kenneth S. Washington, "Statement to the Subcommittee 4B of the Assembly Ways and Means Committee." Unpublished report prepared in Sacramento, California (December 4, 1969).

[22] Ibid., p. 6.

## Summary

In sum, it can be stated that the unavailability of appropriate records leaves something to be desired in the treatment of this data; however, records at Institution "A" and from the State Chancellor's Office conform basically to the perceptions of interviewees. We noted that a significant number of EOP students met the general criteria for admissions and enrolled in SAP in order to secure adequate financing. Reports from the State Colleges Office tended to suggest that given reduced numbers and limits, more EOP students would be "excepted" admissions; however, the perceptions of interviewees were quite the opposite. Generally, they felt that restrictions on numbers of slots increased the competition for entrance. They also felt that more prospective EOP students would tend to meet the General Admissions criteria.

## Chapter Summary

We have noted the difference between General Admissions and Special Admissions in this chapter. Indeed, serious though minor efforts were expanded in 1967 to reach a new population of students and provide opportunities for heretofore "non-traditional college" type applicants. Clearly, "excepted" admissions and Open Admissions have helped ethnic minorities gain entrance to some colleges, and the early research returns indicate that large numbers of "disadvantaged" students can benefit from the college experience.

Concepts of an EOP student have been interpreted by the several state colleges and the Coordinating Council on Higher Education in California for this State. "Excepted" admissions in the four schools tended to "trade off" test scores and good grades for good letters of reference and impressive interviews, as seen by interviewees. Few records were available at the several institutions to compare with perceptions of interviewees; however, those available tended to support their judgments.

Admissions criteria for both General and Specials were about the same in the three state colleges, but each college tended to give more or less weight to reference letters and interviews for "special" admits. Chapter IV will address the problem of special services, i.e., finance, counseling, tutoring, provided students during the five-year period.

# CHAPTER IV

## FINANCIAL AND OTHER STUDENT SUPPORT SERVICES

This chapter treats primarily the issues of financial aid, counseling and tutoring services provided by the four colleges comprising the basic research. As was noted in earlier chapters, the problem of providing financial aid to college students has become increasingly more acute with expanding concepts of educational opportunity in institutions of higher learning. This acuteness has been magnified by sheer numbers as well as by the increased average cost per educational unit earned in today's educational marketplaces.

During a recent interview by the Stanford University School of Education's Black caucus, Leonard Beckum, Black Ph.D. candidate at Stanford and then President of the Education Council, stated that effective counseling was the most important factor contributing to the success or failure of Black students from the time they began school and continuing throughout the university education process.[1]

### Analysis of Findings

The findings included a summary of responses and an analysis of available records. Following is a terse analysis of what seems to be taking place at these institutions.

---

[1] Interview with Leonard Beckum, President of Education Council, Stanford School of Education, Stanford University, by the SUSE's Black Caucas, February, 1972.

## Summary of Responses

A summary of responses revealed that interviewees were reluctant to advance opinions or judgments in areas of unfamiliarity or where few or no records were kept. Perceptions were found to be erratic in each institution, with no fixed course or systematic progression or regression relative to the conduct of services provided students.

## Financial Aid

As had been learned during the case study (Chapter II; it was also found to be true with the schools studied), financial aid was given to students in packages, and estimates were made by respondents relative to the number and percentage of students who received a financial aid package during the five years studied. The total value of each individual economic assistance package depended upon the needs of each student and the amount of financial resources available.

It was noted that respondents had little perception of the total expenditures made for financial aid in these institutions. For example, two respondents each at San Jose State College and the University of California, Berkeley, made no estimate about the number of students receiving financial aid or the total amount spent by the institution in this area. At California State College, Hayward, and at San Francisco State, all interviewees perceived that subsidies were provided for both GAS and SAS in each school, but only one respondent voiced an opinion about the amount of aid given or the number of students participating in this effort.

In several cases, the respondents tended to mirror relative consistency in their perceptions. That is to say, if a respondent estimated that 30 percent of GAS received financial aid during 1966-1967, his valuation of each succeeding year was about the same. At the University of California, Berkeley, two interviewees estimated 25 percent and 50 percent as representing the number of GAS participating in economic aid for each of the five years, and one suggested that 90 to 95 percent represented the thrust of SAS involvement. One respondent at San Jose State reflected this consistency with a perceived rate of 25 percent and 80 percent, respectively, for GAS and SAS involvement. At Cal State, Hayward, one reporter estimated a consistency of 30 percent and 85 percent involvement of GAS and SAS in financial assistance for the last three years ending June, 1971.

The range of estimates regarding student involvement in funding programs included the percentages cited in Table IV-1, for both GAS and SAS. A broad range of estimates was noted in Cal State, Hayward and San Jose State of SAS involvement (40 - 80 percent and 70 - 90 percent, respectively). At San Francisco State and UC, Berkeley, the range of SAS participation was only 80 - 90 percent and 80 - 95 percent, respectively. The upper limits of judgments for GAS participation were 30 percent for each school except UC, Berkeley, where one respondent estimated a high of 50 percent. Each school was perceived to have a different lower limit of GAS participation: San Jose State had 15 percent, Cal State, Hayward, nine percent, San Francisco State, 20 percent, and UC, Berkeley, 30 percent. Readers will note that the estimates of GAS involvement were highest at UC, Berkeley, where the

## TABLE IV-1

### SUMMARY OF PERCEIVED PARTICIPATION OF GENERAL ADMISSIONS STUDENTS AND SPECIAL ADMISSIONS STUDENTS IN FINANCIAL AID PROGRAMS IN CALIFORNIA INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION (1966-1967 through 1970-1971)

| Institution | Estimated Range of Percents Range of Estimates | | | | Perceived Number of Students Participating | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | GAS | | SAS | | GAS | | SAS | |
| | Low | High | Low | High | Low | High | Low | High |
| San Jose State | 15% | 30% | 40% | 80% | 1000 | 6500 | 40 | 1600 |
| Cal State, Hayward | 9% | 30% | 70% | 90% | 400 | 3500 | 0 | 1200 |
| San Francisco State | 20% | 30% | 80% | 90% | 1800 | 6000 | 50 | 800 |
| U.C., Berkeley | 30% | 50% | 80% | 95% | 3000 | 10000 | 25 | 2000 |

Source: Compiled from data collected with part three of the Focused Interview Questionnaire, October, 1971.

cost of education is much higher per unit than at the three state colleges.

It seems that each institution had increased their number of SAS during the five years, with all except San Francisco State being perceived to have expanded this portion of their respective enrollments at an appreciable rate. It seems that San Francisco State has enlarged the SAS registrants at a much slower rate, and that the institution is not using all of its "excepted slots" for Special Admits. With the overall augmentation of SAS, it appears that these schools are spending more money to educate the "non-traditional college type," which at least partially suggests that the tide is shifting to a more acceptable method of dispensing educational funds in higher learning.

Given that a large portion of Special students are ethnic minorities, it appears that these groups are more representative among the college ranks now than was the case in 1966.

All interviewees at San Jose State and most of those in the other institutions voiced concern over whether or not the state was committed to continuing an expenditure of funds for economically disadvantaged youths, and indeed, whether the present thrust in this direction would not shortly be cut off. These concerns seem to emanate from what was perceived to be a leveling off of funds for student assistance in about 1970-71.

While few administrators made estimates of the total numbers of students (GAS and SAS) involved in the financial aid programs, some judgments were made. Table IV-1 shows the low and high estimates for each school. What can be noted here is that very little money was perceived to have been provided SAS at the lower limits. These lower limits figures represent the amount judged to have been provided SAS during the year 1966-1967. The estimated expenditure does increase several-fold for SAS to the high level of 1970-1971 spending. In each case the estimated rate of increase was less for the year ending 1971 than for the preceding years for SAS participation. The number of GAS involved in aid programs was also perceived to have increased rapidly during the five years, but the rate of increase seems to have been higher for SAS (see Table IV-1).

The estimates also tended to substantiate the fact that more money is being provided lower socio-economic and "excepted" students, and that the quantity of effort expanded swiftly over the five years in each institution.

## Counseling Services

Almost all interviewees in each school suggested that counseling was provided for both CAS and SAS, but very few would make estimates regarding the quality of effort or the number of students involved. For example, several administrators at San Jose State and Cal State, Hayward felt that counseling needs were greatest for SAS during their first year of study. Those students who utilized the counseling service generally tended to make adjustments or to drop out of college after a few counseling sessions during their initial year of study.

The estimated number and percentages of SAS students who used the counseling service increased each year throughout the five-year period. At Hayward, the perceptions were that a lower percentage of

SAS students took advantage of the opportunity for counseling each year after 1968. Percentages were felt to have decreased from 75 percent in 1969 to 65 percent by 1971. U.C. Berkeley's estimates dropped steadily from a high of 80 percent SAS inclusion in 1967 to 50 percent for the last two years, 1970 and 1971. At San Francisco State one respondent guessed that 100 percent of all Special Admits were involved in individual counseling during each of the five years, while a second interviewee estimated that only 90 percent of the Special Admits were participating in this service each year. At U.C. Berkeley, judgments were that shortage of qualified counselors and budgetary constraints led to the smaller percentage of SAS involvement in individual counseling. While San Francisco State administrators perceived a high percentage of SAS being counseled, concern was expressed over the ability of the college to provide adequate on-going counseling for Specials.

Despite problems involved in providing and ensuring adequate counseling, it was perceived in each institution that the number of SAS counseled increased rapidly each year until 1970. It was considered that a leveling off in both numbers and percentages of students counseled occurred during the last year.

Again, as indicated earlier, few estimates were made regarding the number or percentages of GAS involved in individual counseling. Estimates at both San Jose State and San Francisco State were that 10 to 15 percent of the regular student populace sought opportunities for individual counseling.

## Tutoring Services

All respondents stated that tutorial aid was available in their respective institutions; however, one administrator at San Jose State felt that students had to be invited to use this service. Indeed, others at each institution voiced uncertainty about how students, either SAS or GAS, would proceed to secure this service.

It appeared that a large proportion of SAS were reluctant to use the tutorial services because they were afraid of being called "dumb," "stupid," "slow," or other degrading labels. This factor was particularly acute at San Francisco State where several respondents voiced this concern. Extra effort had been expended to provide systematic tutorialships in which the tutor and tutee were matched and could set their own schedules. Administrators expressed serious concern about what they felt to be an under-use of tutorial services. The number of SAS students estimated to be involved in tutorial services in these institutions is shown in Table IV-2.

Table IV-2 also shows the estimated number of SAS involved in tutorial help at these schools during the five-year period. One can note that only a small number of SAS were involved during 1966 through 1968. After 1968, the number of SAS receiving tutorial aid was estimated to have increased sharply. No opinions were given about the number of GAS who made use of tutorial services.

At least one interviewee in each institution pointed out the fact that volunteer tutors had been used. In most cases, this was found to be less than satisfactory, and it was generally agreed that paid tutors insured greater results. It seems that San Jose State and

## TABLE IV-2

## SUMMARY OF ESTIMATED TUTORIAL EFFORT FOR SPECIAL ADMITS IN FOUR CALIFORNIA SENIOR INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION (1966-1967 through 1970-1971)

| Institution | Year | Approximate Number of Students |
|---|---|---|
| San Jose State | 1966-1967 | 4 to 15 |
| | 1967-1968 | 25 to 30 |
| | 1968-1969 | 60 to 160 |
| | 1969-1970 | 155 to 195 |
| | 1970-1971 | 280 to 400 |
| Cal State, Hayward | 1966-1967 | No Estimates |
| | 1967-1968 | No Estimates |
| | 1968-1969 | 50 to 75 |
| | 1969-1970 | 150 to 200 |
| | 1970-1971 | 250 to 300 |
| San Francisco State | 1966-1967 | 15 to 30 |
| | 1967-1968 | 30 to 40 |
| | 1968-1969 | 150 to 200 |
| | 1969-1970 | 250 to 350 |
| | 1970-1971 | 275 to 300 |
| U.C., Berkeley | 1966-1967 | 25 to 50 |
| | 1967-1968 | 60 to 90 |
| | 1968-1969 | 150 to 300 |
| | 1969-1970 | 400 to 720 |
| | 1970-1971 | 550 to 840 |

Source: Compiled from data gathered with the Focused Interview Questionnaire, part three, October, 1971.

U.C. Berkeley had experienced considerable success with paid tutors.

Almost all respondents made statements which in effect supported a thesis that SAS perform very well academically when tutorial services are adequate and effectively used.

## Other Services

All interviewees suggested that job placement was provided for all students, and that both general and special students participated. No estimates were advanced relative to the number or percentage of students utilizing this service in all schools. But it was estimated that approximately 1,000 students each year received benefits from the job placement services at San Francisco State, of which almost all were thought to be GAS. This figure included a high percentage of teacher placement. Two individuals considered the consortium with other San Francisco institutions of higher learning as being a positive factor both in identifying possible future students and in aiding in subsequent adjustment to the college environment.

Each interviewee also perceived that all students, both GAS and SAS, during the course of an academic year did make use of the medical services offered; these were characterized as being "minor medical." Respondents felt that the Inter-Ethnic Cultural Center, established at Hayward State in 1968, assisted Special and ethnic minority students in making social and psychological adjustments to academic life.

## Summary Statement

Readers have observed that interviewees were reluctant to express perceptions in areas of unfamiliarity and/or about subjects which they felt lacked sufficient data. Most judgments concerned only the involvement of SAS; few valuations were recorded regarding the GAS' involvement in special services. Few interviewees chose to express opinions about the approximate dollar value of all financial aid rendered in each school.

It was noted, however, that the estimated proportional amount of financial aid provided SAS increased in each institution during the five year period, and particularly after 1968. Also, the researcher was continually reminded that financial and manpower skills resources were perceived to be grossly inadequate for successful Special Admissions Programs in each institution. It seems that the EOP program in each school is burdened with a greater task than financial resources will accommodate, as services provided appear strained to satisfy the demand factor.

Insignificant overall differences were noted in the total efforts and procedures employed in each institution, and at least one respondent in every school voiced concern about budgetary constraints. Some cited the state government's perpetual unwillingness to make available much needed financial appropriations to support Special students.

Administrators in each case were concerned about the future of Special Admissions Programs, as many expressed what they felt to be a lack of commitment on the part of federal and state authorities to the education of lower socio-economic persons, including large numbers of ethnic minorities. Several respondents intimated that they feared these Special Admissions Programs would eventually be phased out of senior institutions of higher education in California.

Financial Aid Reports

A summary of financial aid in the institutions for the five years as evidenced by annual and periodic reports mirrored a somewhat different picture than the administrators' estimates. Complete records were unavailable, and those kept generally focused on the expenditure of funds without regard to GAS or SAS.

Comparative expenditures for the several EOP programs in California State colleges for the last two years ending June, 1971, can be found in Appendix IV-J. San Jose State College provided the only information relative to the quantity and characteristics of ethnic racial recipients of economic assistance. Here, records were available identifying proportional involvement of ethnic individuals for the last three years ending June, 1971. These three years marked the length of EOP programs operating within the state colleges.

Table IV-3 shows a summary of the racial-ethnic student recipients of financial aid at San Jose State College during the three years identified. Scholars and laymen will note that some progress was made in this institution toward financing an education for the "non-traditional college type" student. An abstract of this table suggests that Black American students increased from 369 in 1968-1969 to 756 by 1970-1971, and that these figures represented an advancement from

TABLE IV-3

### SUMMARY OF THE RACIAL-ETHNIC STUDENTS RECEIVING FINANCIAL AID
SAN JOSE STATE COLLEGE
(1968-1969 through 1970-1971)

| GROUP | NUMBER OF RECIPIENTS | | | PERCENT OF RECIPIENTS | | | PERCENT OF GROUP IN STUDENT BODY | | | PERCENT OF THIS GROUP RECEIVING AID | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 68-69 | 69-70 | 70-71 | 68-69 | 69-70 | 70-71 | 68-69 | 69-70 | 70-71 | 68-69 | 69-70 | 70-71 |
| Black American | 369 | 505 | 756 | 12% | 15% | 15% | *1.4% | *2.3% | 3% | *83% | *87% | 91% |
| Native American | 22 | 22 | 15 | 1% | 1% | 0.29% | *1.6% | *1.4% | 1% | *26% | *20% | 4% |
| Asian Americans | 161 | 211 | 198 | 5% | 6% | 4% | *6 % | *4 % | 5% | *18% | *17% | 14% |
| Mexican Americans | 512 | 615 | 892 | 17% | 18% | 18% | *6 % | *4 % | 5% | *72% | *73% | 61% |
| Others | 1,963 | 1,999 | 3,171 | 65% | 60% | 63% | *86% | *86% | 85% | *19% | *18% | 16% |
| TOTAL | 3,027 | 3,352 | 5,032 | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% | | | |

*Estimated figure based upon other information contained in the reports.

Note: Data kept only during the three years of EOP operation.

Source: Compiled from financial aid annual reports (1969, 1970, 1971) at San Jose State College, January-February, 1972 (unpublished documents).

about 1.4 percent to three percent of the total student population. The number of Native Americans tended to remain constant or drop, from 22 students in 1968 to 15 students in 1971. The number of Asian Americans participating in economic aid increased and decreased during the three years, but given the overall growth of the college, one could surmise that this group tends to retain a measure of coherency.

Students identified as "others" were almost exclusively believed to be Euro-Americans. Over the three-year period their participation gradually declined from 65 percent in 1968 to 60 percent by June, 1971. One can quickly note that the much greater portion of financial aid went to the "other" group.

Any comparison of growth cited by "minority" racial groups must consider the growth in the number of students labeled "others," whose numbers expanded from 1,963 in 1968 to 3,171 by 1971. While the Black American group increased at a higher percentage rate than other groups, its total number of enrollees in 1971 does not equal the increase of "other" students.

The overall growth of the college (see Chapter V) in student enrollment more than absorbs the relatively few racial minority students registered with EOP. However, one could recognize some progress, however slight, at this institution in expanding educational opportunity.

As suggested earlier, financial aid reports highlighted the use of various funding programs (see Appendix IV-J for types of funding sources), and little can be determined by the lack of specific information relative to general and special students. One could, however, compare the data in Tables IV-3 and IV-4 and hazard an educated guess about the relative involvement of the two groups in financial aid programs.

Table IV-4 comprises a composite use of several financial aid reports which purvey an outlined picture of expenditures in the four schools. The number and percentage of students sharing educational funds are taken from the general student body, and include both GAS and SAS. Only for the University of California, Berkeley, is there different information provided about funding allocations. Here, only EOP expenditures are listed, and the average amount each participant received is higher than for any of the state colleges. The one exception would be San Jose State for the year 1970-1971, where the average share per student was over $1,500.

## Federal Spending

Readers will quickly note that federal funding sources constitute the greatest thrust of financial aid in the several colleges. For each year, and in each institution, the federal share is above 50 percent of the total yearly funds used.

Indeed, each report reminded administrators of the number of qualified applicants who should have received economic assistance but who went unassisted because of sheer lack of funds. Again, at least part of this shortage lies with the fact that more students from all walks of life and socio-economic strata are currently pursuing a college education.

The approximate number of grant award actions in Table IV-4 indicates total actions of all funding programs. It should be realized

## TABLE IV-4

## SUMMARY OF FINANCIAL AID EFFORTS TO STUDENTS IN FOUR CALIFORNIA SENIOR INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION (1966-1967 through 1970-1971)

| Institution | Year | Approximate Number of Award Actions | Approximate Number of Students | Approximate Percent of Students | Approximate Average Amt. Per Recipient | Approximate Dollar Value Federal | Approximate Dollar Value Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| SAN JOSE STATE | 1966-1967 | ** 2,730 | 2490 | 16% | $1,028. | $2,560,359. | $3,214,234. |
| | 1967-1968 | ** 5,697 | *3250 | *25% | *$1,000. | *$2,890,000. | *$4,384,215. |
| | 1968-1969 | ** 9,048 | 4162 | 23% | $ 937. | $3,018,147. | $5,306,197. |
| | 1969-1970 | ** 10,012 | 4271 | 28% | $1,080. | $3,618,914. | $6,451,240. |
| | 1970-1971 | ** 11,005 | 5032 | 21% | $1,500. | $4,265,000. | $7,310,000. |
| CAL STATE HAYWARD | 1966-1967 | ** 1,126 | 730 | *22% | *$ 860. | *$ 560,000. | $ 603,811. |
| | 1967-1968 | ** 1,855 | * 716 | *20% | *$ 790. | $ 655,000. | *$ 865,470. |
| | 1968-1969 | ** 2,909 | * 911 | *27% | *$ 836. | *$ 980,000. | $1,641,193. |
| | 1969-1970 | ** 3,426 | 1541 | 24.2% | *$ 904. | *$1,890,000. | $2,583,397. |
| | 1970-1971 | ** 4,015 | 1065 | *26% | *$1,034. | *$2,386,390. | $3,247,935. |
| SAN FRANCISCO STATE | 1966-1967 | ** 4,261 | *3026 | *23% | *$ 750. | *$1,840,000. | $2,595,923. |
| | 1967-1968 | ** 5,067 | *4167 | *29% | *$ 850. | *$2,296,480. | $3,018,178. |
| | 1968-1969 | ** 6,846 | *5138 | *25% | *$ 905. | *$4,370,499. | $4,581,221. |
| | 1969-1970 | ** 6,847 | *5105 | *22% | *$ 975. | *$5,685,300. | $6,017,474. |
| | 1970-1971 | ** 9,371 | *5180 | *24% | *$ 990. | *$7,432,760. | $8,225,034. |
| UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA BERKELEY | 1966-1967 | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| | 1967-1968 | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| | 1968-1969 | */* 1,690 | */* 905 | */*88% | */*$1,050. | */*$ 800,000. | */*$1,300,000. |
| | 1969-1970 | */* 2,130 | ***1137 | */*93% | ***$1,197. | ***$1,554,530. | ***$2,441,824. |
| | 1970-1971 | */* 2,305 | ***1117 | ***87% | ***$1,402. | ***$1,105,000. | ***$2,500,000. |

Source: Compiled from financial aid reports secured from the several institutions, January, 1972.
* Information not specifically given; estimate based upon other information provided in reports.
** Number of actual award actions; several students received more than one award.
*** EOP Expenditures only.
*/* Estimated EOP Expenditures only.

that an unusually high proportion of registrants participate in more than one funding source. For example, several students who shared in EOP funds also received other state or federal grants.

No records were available relative to the counseling or tutorial efforts. Such records were so fragmented or inaccessible that no realistic appraisal of these services can be made.

## Chapter Summary

In this chapter, readers have noticed that with expended educational opportunity came a much greater demand for financial and other much needed support for students. The "non-traditional college type" student requires a somewhat different form of service than "traditional types," while all share basic needs for housing, food and living expenses. Special students require greater amounts of financial aid, more intensive counseling (both individual and academic), and tutorial assistance. This extra effort is needed in order to overcome psychological, academic, cultural, and educational differences.

Students in need of financial assistance tended to seek this help without particular reservations, but interviewees and reports have suggested that some "Special" students in need of counseling and tutorial services are reluctant to seek them out. While these three services were rarely completely adequate, opinions and records indicated that identifiable progress had been realized continually in each institution during the five year period. Perceptions and records tended to unfold a steady pattern of growth in both the number of special students recruited and admitted to study, and the subsequent quality of services provided enrollees.

Given that state financial sources had been scarce, institutions nonetheless were granting an increasingly greater proportional share of the wealth to needier students. Federal funds provided no small component to the total financial burden for students in these schools, and a much greater effort from state, local and private (together with federal) sources is needed to effect the goals of EOP and the concept of expanded educational opportunity in higher learning for the State of California.

The primary message resultant from the regular vs. SAS group comparisons is that if one of the functions of the SAS program is to assist these students in gaining equal footing with their regular admissions peers, additional and more effective support must be built into the program.[2]

Chapter V will discuss the racial and ethnic characteristics of students and graduates.

---

[2] Robert L. Trinchero and Morgan S. Stout, Descriptive Academic Information Regarding the 1968-1969 Special Admissions Group at California State College, Hayward. Student Services Report #3, 69/70, an unpublished document. California State College, Hayward, October, 1969, p. 8.

# CHAPTER V

# RACIAL AND ETHNIC CHARACTERISTICS OF STUDENTS AND GRADUATES

This section will treat the ethnic and racial characteristics of students and graduates in the four institutions under study. Tersely addressed are the following: comparative administrative perceptions with availability of reports, interviewees' response to determinants preventing their school from reflecting a more favorable proportional number of ethnic and racial minorities in their college, steps the college could have taken in regard to the above, and whether or not evaluators agreed with the California Master Plan (1960-1975) for Higher Education.

## Treatment of Cases

Readers will note that the different administrators interviewed had varying perceptions of the racial and ethnic composition of their respective student populaces. As noted earlier, records were not kept before 1968 relative to this information; subsequently, college administrations encountered difficulty in securing this data. Students tended to be reluctant to "cooperate" with the school's request to identify racial/ethnic ties on registration forms.

## Summary of Responses

During informal interviews (while this research was being conducted) with Blacks, Chicanos and other ethnic minority groups, the terms "tokenism," "window dressing," and "just a few," or "not too many" were repeatedly used by interviewees. It was these respondents' sincere opinion that the colleges wanted only a small number of Blacks or other minority individuals, and that the two percent excepted admissions served more to limit the number of ethnic minorities than any other single purpose. This perception tended to gain more meaning as the concept of EOP is constantly revised to include all socio-economically deprived students. The latter concepts tend to bring more white students to the campus under EOP auspices, with the result that about one-fifth or 20 percent of all EOP students are white (see Table II-7).

Again, it was difficult to ascertain the true picture of ethnic characteristics of students in the several institutions. Without records regarding the ethnic identify of students, respondents were hesitant to advance estimates. It was observed that these estimates were expressed in either numbers or percents as each interviewee chose one or the other, but not both. Educators interviewed did not choose to make estimates on all areas for each year, and it was somewhat surprising that these estimates were not more widely dispersed. This seemed to be true in each case.

For example, one evaluator at San Jose State chose to use percents for each ethnic group, but declined to make estimates of yearly totals or percents for whites after 1966-1967. Also, this administrator had been a student on this campus during the mid 1960's, and felt that he had observed several changes in the ethnic composition of students during that decade. Other evaluators expressed some difficulty in making projections for the total student body. Each, however, added statements to support their estimates, once their opinions had been given.

Another respondent had been employed at San Jose State longer than the others (over 12 years), and had worked close to the admissions records for several years. His estimates did not include the total student population for the first three years, but did include total student numbers for the last two years. He could give no estimate regarding the number of white students. While this evaluator stated that foreign students were expected to decline in numbers on that campus, his estimate of foreign students continued to increase slightly for the five-year period.

Both the combination of young and senior administrators, and the particular style of erratic responses were found to be about par in each institution.

While perceived percentages were relatively low for each ethnic minority group, responses nonetheless tended to develop a pattern of ascending proportions for each succeeding year evaluated. This rising pattern was particularly evident in estimates regarding Blacks and Mexican-Americans. At Hayward, this was also true for American Indians after 1968. Also at Cal State, Hayward, interviewees suggested that until the EOP's initiation during Fall, 1968, the school had remained almost exclusively white, middle-class oriented. The institution, suggested one interviewee, had completely ignored a large population of Blacks and

Mexican-Americans located very close to the college. He also added that "We [the colleges] tend to completely ignore these situations until someone hits us over the head with the problem."

Respondents estimated that a constant and significant proportion of Asian-Americans (from 10 to 20 percent) were present at San Francisco State and U.C., Berkeley in each of the five years studied.

At San Francisco State, it was suggested that Special Admissions programs had not affected the number of ethnic minority matriculants represented at this institution. Also, that the college did not use all of its special admit "slots" for excepted students, but that some general growth of Black and Mexican American students was evident over the last two years ending June, 1971. Another educator at this school further echoed this conception by suggesting strongly that the relative proportion of Black and Mexican American students had consistently remained very low throughout the history of this college, and that the small growth brought on by EOP was not sufficient enough to warrant special note.

At the University of California, Berkeley, the perceived number of Asian-American and foreign students tended to grow only gradually or to remain stable. Estimates were that this component represented between 10 and 20 percent of all students. Also, unlike other colleges in this study, the total number of students was perceived as increasing or decreasing only slightly, but mostly retaining an enrollment level between 28,000 and 29,000 students.

In sum, it should be noted that perceptions in the several institutions mirrored the following:

1. A very small percentage (one or two percent) of Blacks and other American minorities studying in these institutions before 1968.
2. The proportional number of Blacks, Mexican-Americans and American Indians tended to increase substantially after 1968, but had reached a peak by 1970. San Francisco State, where this increase was only slight, appears to be the exception.
3. Two schools retained a relatively significant representation of Asian-American students throughout the five years (estimated at 10 to 20 percent).
4. Judgments were erratic, apparently due to what was felt to be knowledge too inaccurate to warrant effective evaluations.
5. Interviewees in each institution were both young and veterans, with each maintaining his/her stance independent of the others; there was no extra broad range of estimates.

## Analysis of Reports and Records

A few scattered reports were available showing racial-ethnic breakdowns of students. Table V-1 shows comparative enrollments. Readers will note that enrollment figures remained relatively stable or showed a slight decrease at San Francisco State and the University of California, Berkeley. While registrants increased gradually at San Jose State, Cal State, Hayward registered the greatest proportional increase

## TABLE V-1

### NUMBER OF STUDENTS ENROLLED IN FOUR CALIFORNIA PUBLIC SENIOR INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION (1966-1967 THROUGH 1970-1971)

| Year | San Jose State | Cal State, Hayward | San Francisco State | University of California, Berkeley |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1966-1967 | 22,453 | 7,020 | 17,092 | 28,863 |
| 1967-1968 | 22,475 | 8,290 | 17,532 | 28,132 |
| 1968-1969 | 23,768 | 9,588 | *17,156 | 28,088 |
| 1969-1970 | 23,889 | 11,470 | *15,904 | 28,525 |
| 1970-1971 | 24,574 | 12,520 | *15,472 | 27,712 |

*Estimated number from other information. Exact figure not given in reports.

Source: Yearly reports on campus enrollments in the four institutions (unpublished documents).

(from 7,020 in 1966-1967 to 12,520 students for the academic year ending June, 1971).

It seems that an ethnic survey was conducted on each campus during Fall, 1970. The results are shown in Table V-2. Three columns are used for each institution. These represent the actual number, approximate percent of total student body and the approximate percent these figures collectively represent.

For example, for San Jose State the figures in Table V-2 represent the student responses to a survey conducted by the Ombudsman's office. This office reported on 76.5 percent of the student participation. Thus, 23.5 percent of the students at San Jose State are not accounted for by the figures shown. Cal State, Hayward, is represented by figures which were copied from a report which was not to be released at that time. These numbers were estimated to be about 98 percent accurate.

Available reports from San Francisco State only quoted the percentages indicated in Table V-2; the actual numbers were arrived at by computing fractional measures of the figure listed in Table V-1. Figures in Table V-2 representing U.C., Berkeley, were secured from the Office of the President in Berkeley, and were projected to be close to 100 percent accurate.

The schools usually tended to include foreign students with ethnic and racial minorities. This practice could distort any picture the figures might show. This factor is particularly prevalent at San Francisco State and Berkeley, where foreign students comprise 4.5 percent

TABLE V-2

REPORTED RACIAL AND ETHNIC COMPOSITION OF STUDENTS IN FOUR CALIFORNIA STATE PUBLIC INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION, FALL, 1970

| Ethnic Group | San Jose State | | | Cal State, Hayward | | | San Francisco State | | | U.C., Berkeley | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Number | % of Total Students | Approx. % of Stud. Repre. | Number | % of Total Students | Approx. % of Stud. Repre. | Number | % of Total Students | Approx. % of Stud. Repre. | Number | % of Total Students | Approx. % of Students Represented |
| Black Americans | 828 | 3.36% | | 933 | 8% | | * 930 | 6.2% | | 840 | 4.5% | |
| Mexican Americans | 1,123 | 4.56% | | 334 | 3% | | * 615 | 4.1% | | 439 | 2.3% | |
| American Indians | 342 | 1.39% | | 57 | .25% | | * 105 | .7% | | 93 | .5% | |
| Asian Americans | 1,457 | 5.51% | | 551 | 5% | | *2,070 | 13.8% | | 2,366 | 12.6% | |
| Foreign Students | 601 | 2.44% | | 273 | 2% | | * 660 | 4.4% | | 1,646 | 9.0% | |
| Total Minorities | 4,351 | 17.26% | 76.5% | 2,148 | 18% | 98% | *4,390 | 29.2% | 98% | 5,384 | 28.9% | 100% |
| Others (White) | 19,650 | 82.74% | | 10,188 | 82% | | *10,500 | 70.8% | | *23,141 | *71.1% | |
| Total Students | 24,001 | 100.0% | | 12,336 | 100% | | *14,890 | 100% | | 28,525 | 100.0% | |

*Estimated from other information, exact figure not shown in reports.

Source: Compiled from available records in the named institutions (unpublished documents).

and nine percent, respectively.

Comparison: Perceptions vs. Records

Perceptions had been that Asian-American students represented proportionally high percentages at San Francisco State and U.C., Berkeley. While records show 13.8 percent and 12.6 percent for the two schools, perceptions were close to this average. Except, however, perceptions were somewhat higher for U.C., Berkeley (10 - 20 percent).

Cal State, Hayward seems to have grown in ethnic enrollment rather rapidly; however, this growth would appear to be insignificant when compared both with overall expansion of the school and the fact that there was almost no ethnic minorities before 1968. This information seemed to compare favorably with the perceptions of administrators.

Interviewees had estimated that the total number of foreigners or "other" students would tend to decline as the cost of education in America, and particularly in California, continues to rise. This factor was also noted at U.C., Berkeley, where records show a continual decline in the total number of foreign students on campus during these five years.[1]

Table V-2 shows the number of American Indians studying on these campuses by the academic year 1970-1971. These figures represent a larger percentage of American Indians than official estimates taken during interviews. They represent the approximate total number of American Indians, many of whom may have chosen not to identify with their particular ethnic group during part or all of their college life. The total estimated number of American Indians increased in each institution throughout the five-year period.

---

[1] Office of Institutional Research, Campus Statistics: Fall Quarter, 1967 and Year 1966-1967, 1968-1969, 1967-1968, 1969-1970, and 1970-1971. (University of California, Berkeley: unpublished documents, 1971), p. 16.

Given fragmented reports and other factors previously cited, together with interviewees' observations, Table V-3 was constructed to show racial and ethnic composition of enrollees in the four schools estimated by this writer. These estimates represent both full and part-time students, graduates and undergraduates; the figures should be very close to the actual numbers who attended each school.

In sum, it can be said that Special Admissions programs tended to bring more members of ethnic minorities (except foreign students) to each of the campuses over the period studied. Since a high proportional number of Blacks and Mexican-Americans are involved in the EOP program, some impact can be observed. The exact quantity, however, must remain unknown at this time because the relative percents of ethnic-racial groups in EOP are only pertinent to this discussion if they provide a clearer picture of the total racial-ethnic student bodies.

## Summary of Degrees Awarded

Interviewees were asked about the approximate racial and ethnic composition of all degree recipients, both undergraduate and graduate, for the five-year period. Table V-4 reflects the estimates made by college administrators interviewed, and compares judgments with the recorded data. The table compares both undergraduate and graduate degrees awarded by each college for the five-year period. Readers will note that

TABLE V-3

ESTIMATED RACIAL AND ETHNIC COMPOSITION OF ENROLLEES IN FOUR CALIFORNIA SENIOR PUBLIC INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION
(1966-1967 THROUGH 1970-1971

| Schools | Year | Black Americans | | Mexican Americans | | American Indians | | Asian Americans | | Foreign Students | | White Students | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | No. | % | No. | % | No. | % | No. | % | No. | % | No. | % |
| SAN JOSE STATE | 1966-1967 | 60 | .006 | 115 | .5 | 50 | .25 | 900 | 4.0 | 600 | 3.0 | 20,800 | 92.5 |
| | 1967-1968 | 95 | .01 | 200 | 1.0 | 60 | .25 | 1,000 | 4.8 | 500 | 2.25 | 20,700 | 92.2 |
| | 1968-1969 | 250 | 1.4 | 450 | 2.2 | 130 | 1.0 | 1,150 | 4.9 | 550 | 2.75 | 20,450 | 87.75 |
| | 1969-1970 | 600 | 2.8 | 800 | 3.0 | 250 | 1.1 | 1,300 | 5.0 | 600 | 2.25 | 20,350 | 84.85 |
| | 1970-1971 | 830 | 3.50 | 1,150 | 4.50 | 325 | 1.25 | 1,450 | 5.50 | 610 | 2.50 | 20,325 | 82.75 |
| CAL STATE HAYWARD | 1966-1967 | 30 | .4 | 20 | .25 | 10 | .10 | 375 | 4.0 | 305 | 5.50 | 6,300 | 89.5 |
| | 1967-1968 | 75 | .8 | 40 | .5 | 20 | .10 | 380 | 4.0 | 290 | 4.0 | 7,600 | 90.85 |
| | 1968-1969 | 225 | 4.0 | 90 | 1.6 | 35 | .175 | 425 | 5.0 | 260 | 3.0 | 8,990 | 86.64 |
| | 1969-1970 | 550 | 7.0 | 210 | 2.4 | 60 | .333 | 500 | 5.1 | 300 | 3.2 | 9,910 | 81.95 |
| | 1970-1971 | 940 | 8.0 | 330 | 3.0 | 60 | .333 | 550 | 5.2 | 275 | 2.0 | 10,300 | 81.45 |
| SAN FRANCISCO STATE | 1966-1967 | 125 | 1.1 | 80 | .7 | 10 | .10 | 1,700 | 13.0 | 815 | 5.0 | 15,420 | 80.19 |
| | 1967-1968 | 275 | 2.2 | 150 | 1.1 | 20 | .50 | 1,750 | 13.0 | 825 | 5.0 | 14,225 | 78.68 |
| | 1968-1969 | 600 | 3.0 | 360 | 2.3 | 50 | .16 | 1,800 | 13.5 | 775 | 4.5 | 13,550 | 76.55 |
| | 1969-1970 | 750 | 5.0 | 570 | 3.8 | 100 | .8 | 2,000 | 14.0 | 750 | 4.5 | 11,800 | 71.9 |
| | 1970-1971 | 930 | 6.0 | 620 | 4.2 | 110 | .7 | 2,100 | 14.0 | 700 | 4.5 | 11,010 | 70.6 |
| UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA AT BERKELEY | 1966-1967 | 75 | .3 | 25 | .2 | 10 | .001 | 2,000 | 11.0 | 2,050 | 11.3 | 24,740 | 77.19 |
| | 1967-1968 | 120 | .7 | 70 | .3 | 20 | .070 | 2,200 | 11.0 | 2,000 | 11.1 | 23,790 | 76.73 |
| | 1968-1969 | 325 | 1.6 | 160 | .8 | 40 | .050 | 2,300 | 12.0 | 2,000 | 11.0 | 23,275 | 74.55 |
| | 1969-1970 | 675 | 3.3 | 390 | 1.7 | 80 | .7 | 2,400 | 13.0 | 1,960 | 10.1 | 22,995 | 71.2 |
| | 1970-1971 | 850 | 4.5 | 450 | 2.2 | 90 | .5 | 2,400 | 13.0 | 1,875 | 10.0 | 22,175 | 69.8 |

Source: Estimated by Howard Alford, based upon available reports, perceptions of respondents, and observations.

## TABLE V-4

### COMPARISON OF PERCEPTIONS AND RECORDS REFLECTING THE NUMBER OF DEGREES AWARDED BY FOUR CALIFORNIA SENIOR PUBLIC INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION (1966-1967 THROUGH 1970-1971)

| School | Year | Range of Perceptions Under BS Grad. Degree |  | Recorded Figure | Range of Perceptions Graduate Degrees |  | Recorded Figure | Total Degrees Awarded |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
|  |  | Low | High |  | Low | High |  |  |
| SAN JOSE STATE | 1966-1967 | 1309 | 2789 | 3167 | 225 | 430 | 575 | 3742 |
|  | 1967-1968 | 1462 | 3318 | *2197 | 221 | 530 | *497 | *3694 |
|  | 1968-1969 | 1491 | 3794 | 4076 | 238 | 631 | 700 | 4776 |
|  | 1969-1970 | 1546 | 4375 | 4136 | 241 | 748 | 822 | 4958 |
|  | 1970-1971 | 1747 | 4655 | 4220 | 240 | 854 | 922 | 5142 |
| CAL STATE HAYWARD | 1966-1967 | 250 | 500 | 575 | 25 | 100 | 52 | 627 |
|  | 1967-1968 | 325 | 600 | 850 | 50 | 100 | 56 | 906 |
|  | 1968-1969 | 400 | 1200 | 1165 | 50 | 100 | 89 | 1254 |
|  | 1969-1970 | 600 | 1500 | 1385 | 60 | 150 | 131 | 1516 |
|  | 1970-1971 | 800 | 1800 | 1811 | 60 | 200 | 178 | 1989 |
| SAN FRANCISCO STATE | 1966-1967 | 600 | 1500 | 3178 | 500 | 1000 | **925 | **4093 |
|  | 1967-1968 | 943 | 1200 | 2938 | 500 | 1200 | 915 | 3853 |
|  | 1968-1969 | 1165 | 1320 | 2949 | 600 | 1500 | 1049 | 3998 |
|  | 1969-1970 | 1592 | 2400 | 2843 | 650 | 1600 | 1099 | 3942 |
|  | 1970-1971 | 1921 | 2600 | 2847 | 700 | 1800 | 1092 | 3936 |
| UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA AT BERKELEY | 1966-1967 | 2000 | 3750 | 4507 | 2000 | 4000 | 3161 | 7668 |
|  | 1967-1968 | 2100 | 4100 | 4543 | 2000 | 4500 | 2976 | 7519 |
|  | 1968-1969 | 2500 | 4500 | 4479 | 2000 | 3800 | 3376 | 7855 |
|  | 1969-1970 | 2500 | 5800 | 5107 | 2000 | 4200 | 3344 | 8451 |
|  | 1970-1971 | 3000 | 6000 | 5693 | 2500 | 4000 | 3445 | 9138 |

* Through January 1968 only. Record for June, 1968 not available.
**Not given in record. Estimate based on other information.

Source: Compiled from Part 4 of the interview questionnaire and from admissions offices in the institutions.

individual perceptions are not recorded here, only the range of estimates.

## Undergraduate Degrees

A limited number of persons chose to advance estimates on the number of degrees awarded by the colleges. It was noticed that some estimates were generally lower than what the records revealed. In each school at least one individual's estimates were consistently well below the record, with a continual average of about two-thirds the total undergraduate degrees awarded. Some interviewees were much more accurate in their perceptions, and usually at least one made judgments relatively close to those shown by the record (Table V-4). Essentially, the difference between the estimates was that some estimates tended to be fairly low while other perceptions were low initially, but moved higher at a rapid pace. Almost all respondents felt that the number of degrees increased each year, which the record reflected, but the rate and level of degrees awarded was the actual difference.

## Graduate Degrees

Comparing the estimated number of graduate degrees to the record reveals a similar pattern to the one established for undergraduate degrees However, all estimates were lower than the recorded number of graduate degrees awarded at San Jose State. Perceptions at the other schools covered a range which included the actual figures indicated by college records. Once again, each case was characterized by having one response reflecting consistently lower figures than those recorded. Generally, opinions tended to be either low or about on target, and a wide dispersement of estimates did not materialize.

In sum, without records depicting comparative ethnic or racial identifies of degree recipients, it is not known what actually occurred. Junior and community college transfers should be considered in making estimates, but clearly, the fragmented data suggest that more students from ethnic and racial minorities received degrees after 1968 from the several schools. One must recognize that a disproportionate measure of minorities were still registered as lower classmen, and estimates based upon enrollment expansions could be misleading.

Considering prospects according to the statistics, perceptions, and observations cited, there clearly are ethnic minority individuals receiving degrees from these institutions. However, the number and its relative significance remains in some doubt. Evidence suggests that a greater effort is needed to insure a fairer proportion of ethnic and racial degree recipients from senior institutions.

It is our belief that within a few years a more acceptable ratio of ethnic minority students will be receiving degrees from California's senior institutions of higher education. The impact of Special Admissions programs should be recognized more clearly among the degree recipients after June, 1971.

## Major Determinants Preventing Colleges From Reflecting A More Equitable Racial and Ethnic Composition Among Students

Interviewees were asked what three major determinants prevented their college from reflecting a more equitable racial and ethnic composition in its total student body relative to the approximate racial and ethnic population of the surrounding communities for each of the five years ending June, 1971.

## Analysis of Findings

Most interviewees perceived few determinants, and almost exclusively listed their perceptions as being the same throughout the five-year period. Table V-5 reflects a summary of these barriers as perceived by the interviewees. This table also shows the barriers mentioned and the number of times each barrier was identified in the respective schools.

As can be seen in Table V-5, the barriers mentioned most often were: 1) admissions policies, 2) insufficient financial aid for students, 3) lack of commitment on part of the college to recruit and educate ethnic minorities, and 4) lack of fiscal capability of students' parents. Several barriers were listed only once, as shown in the table.

## Similarities in Perceptions

Admissions policies and lack of financial aid for ethnic minorities were the major determinants perceived by the educators interviewed. This was true in each of the four institutions studied. The only other determinant which was mentioned at least twice in each institution was lack of commitment on the part of the college to recruit and educate ethnic minorities. Two additional determinants were mentioned in three of the four schools. These were: lack of fiscal capability of students' parents, and lack of concern for ethnic minorities by the college.

## Differences in Determinants Listed by Institutions

San Jose State listed four determinants which were not mentioned

## TABLE V-5

### SUMMARY OF PERCEIVED DETERMINANTS PREVENTING COLLEGES FROM REFLECTING A MORE EQUITABLE RACIAL AND ETHNIC COMPOSITION OF STUDENTS RELATIVE TO THE APPROXIMATE RACIAL AND ETHNIC POPULATION OF THE SURROUNDING COMMUNITIES

| Determinants or Barriers | Number of Times Mentioned in Each College | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | San Jose State | Cal State Hayward | San Francisco State | U.C. Berkeley | Total |
| 1. Administration and Admission policies | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 12 |
| 2. Insufficient financial aid to students | 3 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 11 |
| 3. Lack of commitment on part of school to recruit and educate ethnic minorities | 2 | 2. | 2 | 2 | 8 |
| 4. Lack of fiscal capability by students' parents | 2 | | 2 | 3 | 7 |
| 5. Lack of concern for ethnic minorities by the college | 2 | 1 | 2 | | 5 |
| 6. Psychological factor for both local citizenry and ethnic minority groups | | 2 | 2 | | 4 |
| 7. Transportation | | 3 | | | 3 |
| 8. Excepted admissions limits and quotas for ethnic minorities | 1 | | | 2 | 3 |
| 9. Systematic White Racism | 2 | | | | 2 |
| 10. Lack of sufficient qualified applicants | 1 | 1 | | | 2 |

TABLE V-5 (Continued)

| Determinants or Barriers | Number of Times Mentioned in Each College | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | San Jose State | Cal State Hayward | San Francisco State | U.C. Berkeley | Total |
| 11. White racism and conservativeness of local community, and psychological alienation of ethnic groups | | 2 | | | 2 |
| 12. Lack of perception of college as a reasonable goal for minority groups | | 2 | | | 2 |
| 13. Counseling ethnic minorities in public schools has not led them to college | | | | 2 | 2 |
| 14. Inadequate academic preparation by ethnic minorities | | 1 | | 1 | 2 |
| 15. Newness of special admit programs and the state legislature has not had a chance to react | 2 | | | | 2 |
| 16. Insufficient housing | | 2 | | | 2 |
| 17. Geographical location | | 2 | | | 2 |
| 18. The California Master Plan which forces most ethnic minorities to community colleges | | | 1 | | 1 |
| 19. The college was not designed to meet the needs of minority groups | | | 1 | | 1 |
| 20. Awareness on the part of ethnic minorities | 1 | | | | 1 |

TABLE V-5 (Continued)

| Determinants or Barriers | Number of Times Mentioned in Each College | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | San Jose State | Cal State Hayward | San Francisco State | U.C. Berkeley | Total |
| 21. Lack of information from students and parents | 1 | | | | 1 |
| 22. Lack of understanding on part of higher education as to the needs of minority groups | | 1 | | | 1 |
| 23. Lack of parental and other pressures on ethnic minorities to attend college | | 1 | | | 1 |
| Totals | 20 | 26 | 13 | 16 | 75 |

Source: Compiled from data gathered with Focused Interview Questionnaire, Part 3.

by any other college, and opinions at Cal State, Hayward revealed eight barriers which were not mentioned by any other college. San Francisco State was characterized as perceiving only two determinants not mentioned by other colleges, while the judgments recorded at U.C., Berkeley showed only one determinant not mentioned by the first three colleges. The eight determinants uniquely associated with Cal State, Hayward, reveal a particularly acute range of perceptions at this college (Table V-5).

As shown in the table, this institution stands out as having some active influences which may not be as strong in the other colleges as perceived by administrators.

The perceptions at San Jose State were second highest in number of determinants not recorded in other institutions. Here, as at San Francisco State and Berkeley, the respondents mentioned determinants which were also recorded in other schools. Collectively, these three schools perceived a total of seven determinants not mentioned by others, which represents one less different determinant than was judged at Cal State, Hayward, alone. It was noted, however, that more interviewees at San Francisco State and Berkeley had "no opinions" in this area than those in the first two colleges. This can be seen in the total number indicated in their respective columns in Table V-5.

In sum, it can be said that perceptions recorded in the four schools reflect a similarity with respect to the following determinants:

1. Admissions Policies
2. Financial aid for ethnic minority students
3. The lack of commitment on the part of the college to the recruitment and education of ethnic minorities.

The areas of difference tend to illustrate that Cal State, Hayward, with eight perceived determinants not mentioned by other schools, was uniquely different from the other three colleges. However, it must be considered that some interviewees in the other schools did not elect to mention these determinants.

## What Colleges Should Have Done

Interviewees were asked what three most important steps their college could have taken to make the racial and ethnic characteristics of the total student populace more reflective of the approximate ethnic population of the surrounding communities.

### Analysis of Findings

Several interviewees responded with "no opinion," "don't know," or "the institution is doing what it can." Table V-7 summarizes the perceptions stated by interviewees. It was noted that each respondent felt that those steps he or she listed applied to each and all of the five years. The number of persons who voiced no important steps their college could have taken is shown below in Table V-6.

TABLE V-6

NUMBER OF INTERVIEWEES IN FOUR CALIFORNIA SENIOR
PUBLIC INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION
STATING NO PERCEPTIONS OF IMPORTANT STEPS
COLLEGE COULD HAVE TAKEN

| Institution | Number Interviewed | Number not Stating Perceptions |
|---|---|---|
| San Jose State | 5 | 1 |
| Cal State, Hayward | 4 | 1 |
| San Francisco State | 5 | 3 |
| U.C., Berkeley | 4 | 2 |

## TABLE V-7

## SUMMARY OF PERCEIVED IMPORTANT STEPS COLLEGES COULD HAVE TAKEN TO MAKE THE RACIAL AND ETHNIC CHARACTERISTICS OF THEIR STUDENT POPULACE MORE REFLECTIVE OF THE APPROXIMATE ETHNIC POPULATION OF SURROUNDING COMMUNITIES

| Perceived Important Steps | Number of Times Mentioned in Each College | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | San Jose State | Cal State Hayward | San Fran. State | U.C. Berkeley | Total |
| 1. Very little under state provisions and budgetary constraints | | | 1 | | 1 |
| 2. Open Admissions | | | 1 | | 1 |
| 3. More innovative work-study programs | | | 1 | | 1 |
| 4. A more diversified curriculum, making it meet the needs of all segments of the population | | | 1 | | 1 |
| 5. Change admissions requirements | 1 | | 1 | 2 | 4 |
| 6. Hire more minority persons on administrative staff | 1 | 1 | | | 2 |
| 7. Intensify recruitment program throughout the state for minorities | 2 | 2 | | | 4 |
| 8. Initiate programs like EOP earlier | 1 | 1 | | | 2 |
| 9. Offered more financial aid to students | 3 | 1 | | 1 | 5 |
| 10. Allowed students to come to college without standard requirements | 1 | | | | 1 |

TABLE V-7 (Continued)

| Perceived Important Steps | Number of Times Mentioned in Each College | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | San Jose State | Cal State Hayward | San Fran. State | U.C. Berkeley | Total |
| 11. Make the state legislature more aware of the problems of ethnic minorities | 1 | | | | 1 |
| 12. Increase the quota of excepted students | 2 | | | 1 | 3 |
| 13. More active communication with community agencies | | 1 | | | 1 |
| 14. Begin to realize earlier the large population of Mexican Americans near the college | | 1 | | | 1 |
| 15. Should have arranged better housing provisions | | 1 | | | 1 |
| 16. The institution is doing what it can | | 2 | | | 2 |
| 17. Educating high school and community colleges to the need for minorities to attend college | 1 | | | 1 | 2 |
| 18. Nothing, "don't know," or "no opinion" | 1 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 7 |
| TOTALS | 14 | 11 | 8 | 7 | 40 |

Source: Compiled from data gathered with the Focused Interview Questionnaire, Part 3.

Oddly enough, at San Francisco State one interviewee each responded with "nothing," "I don't know," and "no opinion." This marked the only commonality shared by the colleges in their respective response to the question.

## Similarities

While no specific commonality of important steps was perceived (except one each with "no opinion") in each institution, two steps came close to being named in each school. These were: "more financial aid to students," and "change admissions policies."

As can be noted in Table V-7, each response recorded in this category at U.C. Berkeley was also mentioned at least once in one of the other colleges.

## Differences

Important steps as perceived by respondents at San Jose State included only two items which were not mentioned by at least one other school (items 10 and 11, Table V-7). Cal State, Hayward, was noted as articulating four steps (items 13, 14, 15 and 16) which were not mentioned by others, while respondents at San Francisco State listed four items (items 1, 2, 3 and 4) which were not mentioned by other colleges. In the interest of clarity, no attempt was made to group these perceptions except the last item (#18) to appear in the table.

Some interviewees chose to make qualifying statements to clarify their position (or lack of position).

## San Jose State

One respondent summarized his comments in this area by stating that it was a simple matter of money, and named two local college administrators (Dr. Robert Smith and Dr. Dunzel) who had attempted to make the California legislature more aware of the problems of ethnic minorities. Another interviewee stressed the disproportionate number of Mexican American students enrolled in this institution, and concluded by citing the following statistics: Blacks make up five percent of the local population and five percent of the students; American Indians have .3 percent of the local population and one percent of the students. Asian Americans comprise 1.5 percent of the local population and five percent of the students, while Chicanos are 20 percent of the population and only four percent of the students.

## Cal State, Hayward

Two interviewees who stated "the college is doing what it can" (Table V-7) subsequently referred to a policy statement recently released by the college president relative to the hiring of minority applicants. These respondents felt that the statement was a good effort by their college, and added that they did not know if the college could have done more. Another interviewee who cited failure of the college to recognize a large population of Mexican Americans near the campus (item 14, Table V-7), stated, "We seem to fail to recognize needs in these areas until someone hits us over the head with the problem."

San Francisco State

Qualifying statements relative to important steps colleges could have taken at San Francisco State included the following:

1. No change had been made over the years relative to the improvement of minority educational opportunity, and the college is decidedly going backwards.
2. The college could not control the money or the administration.

As noted earlier, most interviewees in this institution responded with "no opinion," "nothing," or "I don't know."

U.C., Berkeley

No qualifying statements were voiced or recorded at U.C., Berkeley. Once opinions were articulated, no further statements followed.

In summarizing these perceptions, relative to the important steps colleges could have taken to provide more equal educational opportunity for ethnic minorities, it can be said that administrators mentioned the following steps most often:

1. Offered more financial aid to students
2. Change admissions requirements
3. Intensify recruitment throughout the state for the ethnic minority student.

Several interviewees did not mention any procedures or action which the college could have taken, as noted by the "no opinions" expressed. While no specific item was mentioned in every institution, a closer look reflects similarities in many of the items suggested with different emphasis. For example, Table V-7 lists several items which could be grouped under "change admissions policies," or "hiring practices." However, in the interest of clarity and discussion of specific differences, no such grouping was done.

## The California Master Plan

Interviewees were asked if they agreed with the California Master Plan which stated in 1960 that the California public education in institutions of higher learning (including the university system, the state colleges and the community colleges) serve primarily their local and regional areas. Table V-8 provides a summary of these responses. As observed in the table, the number of persons interviewed in each institution was: San Jose State - five, Cal State, Hayward - four, San Francisco State - five, and U.C., Berkeley - four.

### Analysis of Findings

Among the eighteen persons interviewed in the four institutions, it can be noted that only the University of California at Berkeley drew an even number of "yes" and "no" responses, with no "no opinions." The same pattern of responses to the Master Plan were stated at San Francisco State, with one "no opinion." Respondents at San Jose State and Cal State, Hayward had almost reverse opinions, as three persons agreed with the plan at Cal State, Hayward, while three persons disagreed with the plan as recorded at San Jose State. Each school had one individual with "no opinion," but one interviewee at San Jose State agreed with the plan, and no respondents at Cal State, Hayward seemed to disagree with

TABLE V-8

SUMMARY OF RESPONSES FROM FOUR INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION
TO THE CALIFORNIA MASTER PLAN FOR HIGHER EDUCATION

| Year | Institutional Responses | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | San Jose State | | | Cal State, Hayward | | | San Francisco State | | | U. C. Berkeley | | |
| | Yes | No | No Opinion | Yes | No | No Opinion | Yes | No | No Opinion | Yes | No | No Opinion |
| 1966-1967 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 0 |
| 1967-1968 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 0 |
| 1968-1969 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 0 |
| 1969-1970 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 0 |
| 1970-1971 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 0 |

Source: Compiled from data gathered with Focused Interview Questionnaire, Part 3.

with the Master Plan.

Comments From San Jose State

A summary of comments supporting the responses from San Jose State, include the following:

1. The one person agreeing with the Master Plan and the "no opinion" response were followed by no additional remarks.
2. The three persons responding negatively to the Master Plan stated:
    a. that the school did not serve all racial groups equally,
    b. that the school should be for all California residents without regard to the local community aspect,
    c. that recruitment was not limited to the surrounding areas, but extended to a much broader community,
    d. a final comment in this regard was that Chicanos were not represented in the college according to their population in the community or statewide.

Cal State Hayward

As was seen in Table V-8, no person interviewed made supportive statements about the Master Plan. Of the two respondents who agreed with the Plan, one added that he was certain that the concept was true in the state colleges, but in actuality, the university system served more than the regional populations. The other interviewee stated that he agreed with the concept written into the plan, but that the colleges, including his school, were not reaching significant numbers of ethnic minority students who have been systematically excluded from full participation in higher education all around the United States.

San Francisco State

At this college two persons made qualifying statements about their opinions. Both respondents disagreed with the Master Plan. Their comments were:

1. A student in New York has the same opportunity as the student across the street in gaining admission to the college,
2. While public education must provide education for locals and Special Admissions students, the schools must maximize their academic standards and be prepared to accept students from other states,
3. The school is not meeting the needs of the masses of ethnic minorities in the surrounding communities, and
4. The area of recruitment for Special Admissions students has been limited to the local community.

U.C. Berkeley

With the responses split evenly between positive and negative perspectives in this institution, it was observed that one person who agreed added, "yes, for whites," while the other positive response was followed with, "I think so." Both persons who disagreed with the Plan added similar statements relative to the fact that the university drew students from a much larger community, including national and international boundaries.

In summarizing the opinions about the California Master Plan for Higher Education, it can be said that the responses were about even in the number who agreed and disagreed with the Plan. Three persons, one in each of three schools, gave no opinion in this area. Each institution was marked by responses citing the inequality of educational opportunity for ethnic minorities as one limiting factor in the concepts of the California Master Plan.

## Chapter Summary

Readers have noted that each institution has increased its proportional number of racial and ethnic minority students among its registrants. How many, and the relative significance of these figures, are inconclusive, but it would appear that higher education is still a long way from witnessing the approximate proportions of "disadvantaged" students in the colleges and universities which are represented in the surrounding communities and throughout the state. It does appear, however, that a somewhat greater effort is being made in some schools.

Considering the findings, it is clear that before 1968 the enrollment of ethnic racial minorities was very small in each of the several schools. Much of the rationalization for this factor has already been exhausted. San Jose State and Cal State, Hayward seemed to be growing in enrollment very rapidly, while San Francisco State and U.C. Berkeley tended to retain a level of consistency throughout the five-year period. Minority and "excepted" students appeared to expand at a higher rate in the first two schools. Apparently, before 1965, the number of minority students in these schools was almost a hand count; indeed, at Cal State, Hayward, perhaps there were none at all. Although few in number, San Francisco State seemed to maintain a consistency of minority students.

While a much greater overall effort is needed both at the college and university level throughout the state and nation, the expansion of minority educational opportunity at Cal State, Hayward might be worthy of some notice. For public institutions, it would appear that the task of evaluating educational opportunities and educating ethnic and racial minorities in higher education has just begun. Still needed is knowledge reflecting the performance of Special Admissions students compared to General Admissions students in the several institutions. It is to that subject that we now turn.

## CHAPTER VI

## THE PERFORMANCE OF SPECIAL ADMISSIONS STUDENTS RELATIVE TO THE PERFORMANCE OF GENERAL ADMISSIONS STUDENTS

> "Man should not be judged by the heights
> to which he attains, but by the depths
> from which he came. . . ."
> --Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr.

This chapter consists of two major parts. Part one treats interviewees' perceptions of the average performance for Special Admissions students relative to the average performance for General Admissions students WHO CAME FROM SIMILAR SOCIO-ECONOMIC BACKGROUNDS AND DID NOT RECEIVE SPECIAL SERVICES (i.e., financial, counseling, or tutorial). Part two will address the implications of evaluators' perceptions of the average performance of Special students relative to General students (total non-Specials). In each case interviewees made judgments in six different areas of progress for each of the five years studied, and their perceptions were recorded on a continuum from one to six (see Appendix VI-1).

### Summary of Responses

What follows is a discussion of findings treating each item separately. Readers should be cognizant of the fact that this chapter is not concerned with racial or ethnic differences.

(1) Grades Earned: A summary of the perceptions held by interviewees at Cal State Hayward with reference to GPA earned by the two groups reflects a continual improvement of Special Admissions students but at a somewhat slower pace than at San Jose State, where two

respondents evaluated Specials to be "decidedly higher" in 1970 and 1971. All those interviewed at Cal State, Hayward, had some perception in each of the six categories which was somewhat different from the other schools, all of which had at least one person who expressed "no opinion" in one or more of the componential segments. Most of the ratings of the other three schools were about the same or somewhat lower for Special Admits.

Ratings for the first two years show that Special Admits were mostly earning "somewhat lower" or "decidedly lower" grades than regular students at Cal State, Hayward and San Jose State. Most ratings at San Francisco State and U.C., Berkeley were "about the same" except for the "no opinions" for each of the five years.

Qualifying statements included the following:

1. Special students tend to earn low grades the first year or two, but subsequently perform much better.
2. At San Jose State and Cal State, Hayward it was stated that SAP brought mostly athletes to the campus during 1966-1968, and few special tutoring and counseling services were provided.
3. "No opinion" apprizements were voiced due to lack of sufficient records to support judgments. This was true for all areas (see Table VI-1) and cases where "no opinions" were recorded.

(2) Progress Toward Degree Requirements. Again, most interviewees perceived the progress toward degree requirements to be "about the same" or "somewhat lower" collectively. However, it was observed that two respondents at San Jose State and Cal State, Hayward perceived Special students as progressing "decidedly faster" and "somewhat faster" for two years. Table VI-1 also shows that one evaluator judged Specials

# TABLE VI-1

## SUMMARY OF INTERVIEWEES' PERCEPTIONS OF THE AVERAGE PERFORMANCE FOR SPECIAL ADMISSIONS STUDENTS RELATIVE TO THE AVERAGE PERFORMANCE OF GENERAL ADMISSIONS STUDENTS FROM SIMILAR SOCIO-ECONOMIC BACKGROUNDS IN FOR CALIFORNIA INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION

| Areas of Progress | Year | Decidedly Lower 1 | | | | Somewhat Lower 2 | | | | About the Same 3 | | | | Somewhat Higher 4 | | | | Decidedly Higher 5 | | | | No Opinion 6 | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | A | B | C | D | A | B | C | D | A | B | C | D | A | B | C | D | A | B | C | D | A | B | C | D |
| 1) Grades Earned | 1966-67 | | 1 | | | 2 | 3 | | 1 | 2 | | 2 | 2 | | | | | | | | | 1 | | 3 | 1 |
| | 1967-68 | | 1 | | | 1 | 3 | | 1 | 2 | | 2 | 2 | 1 | | | | | | | | 1 | | 3 | 1 |
| | 1968-69 | | | | | 1 | 3 | | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 2 | | | | | | | | 1 | | 3 | 1 |
| | 1969-70 | | | | | 2 | 3 | | | 1 | 1 | 2 | 3 | | | | | 1 | | | | 1 | | 3 | 1 |
| | 1970-71 | | | | | 2 | 2 | | | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 | | | | | 1 | | | | | | 3 | 1 |
| 2) Progress Toward Degree Requirements | 1966-67 | | | | | 2 | 2 | 1 | | 2 | 1 | 2 | 4 | | 1 | | | | | | | 1 | | 2 | |
| | 1967-68 | | | | | 1 | 2 | 1 | | 3 | 1 | 2 | 4 | | 1 | | | | | | | 1 | | 2 | |
| | 1968-69 | | | | | 1 | 1 | 1 | | 2 | 3 | 2 | 4 | 1 | | | | | | | | | | 2 | |
| | 1969-70 | | | | | 1 | | 1 | | 2 | 4 | 2 | 4 | | | | | 1 | | | | 1 | | 2 | |
| | 1970-71 | | | | | | | 2 | | 4 | 4 | 1 | 4 | | | | | 1 | | | | 1 | | 2 | |
| 3) Social Adjustment | 1966-67 | | | | | 2 | | | | 2 | 4 | 2 | 3 | 1 | | | | | | | | | | 3 | 1 |
| | 1967-68 | | | | | 1 | 1 | | | 3 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 1 | | | | | | | | | | 3 | 1 |
| | 1968-69 | | | | | 1 | 1 | | | 2 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 2 | | | | | | | | | | 3 | 1 |
| | 1969-70 | | | | | 1 | | | | 2 | 4 | 2 | 3 | 1 | | | | 1 | | | | | | 3 | 1 |
| | 1970-71 | | | | | | | | | 3 | 4 | 2 | 3 | 1 | | | | 1 | | | | | | 3 | 1 |
| 4) Adjustment to Academic Rigors | 1966-67 | | 1 | | | 4 | 3 | | | 1 | | 3 | 4 | | | | | | | | | | | 2 | |
| | 1967-68 | | 1 | | | 3 | 3 | | | 2 | | 3 | 4 | | | | | | | | | | | 2 | |
| | 1968-69 | | | | | 3 | 4 | | | 1 | | 3 | 4 | 1 | | | | | | | | | | 2 | |
| | 1969-70 | | | | | 2 | 3 | | | 2 | 1 | 3 | 4 | 1 | | | | | | | | | | 2 | |
| | 1970-71 | | | | | 1 | 3 | 1 | | 3 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 1 | | | | | | | | | | 2 | |
| 5) Dropout Rate | 1966-67 | | | | | 1 | 1 | | 1 | 1 | | 3 | 2 | 2 | 1 | | | 1 | 2 | | | | | 2 | 1 |
| | 1967-68 | | | | | 2 | | | 1 | | 1 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 2 | | | | 1 | | | | | 2 | 1 |
| | 1968-69 | 1 | | | | 3 | | | 1 | | 2 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 2 | | | | | | | | | 2 | 1 |
| | 1969-70 | 2 | | | | 1 | 1 | | 1 | | 1 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | | | | | | | | | 2 | 1 |
| | 1970-71 | 2 | | | | 1 | 1 | | 1 | | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | | | | | | | | 2 | 1 |
| 6) Time Taken To Earn Degree | 1966-67 | | 2 | | | 1 | | | 1 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | | | | | 1 | | | | 1 | | 2 | |
| | 1967-68 | | 2 | | | | | | 1 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 3 | | | | | | | | | 1 | | 2 | |
| | 1968-69 | | | | | 1 | 3 | | 1 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 3 | | | | | | | | | 1 | | 2 | |
| | 1969-70 | 1 | | | | | 3 | | 1 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 3 | | | | | | | | | 1 | | 2 | |
| | 1970-71 | 1 | | | | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | | | | | | | | | 1 | | 2 | |

Source: Compiled with data gathered with Part Four of the Focused Interview Questionnaire, 1972.

to be "somewhat faster" at San Jose State. Aside from the "no opinions" at San Francisco State and San Jose State, all remaining judgments are clustered near the center. Again, U.C., Berkeley was characterized as perceiving all students as performing "about the same" for each year. Generally, more ratings of "somewhat lower" were made during the first two years. Collectively, some progress is perceived by Specials over Generals in this category on a year-to-year basis. Each years shows a generally increased rating for Special students, so that by 1970-71, all persons rated the progress of the two groups as being about the same or "faster" in favor of Specials. This year witnessed special ratings as "somewhat faster" and "decidedly faster" progress than General students from similar socio-economic backgrounds. It seems that Special Admits tended to perform about the same as their peer group in each school year during the last three years, which marked the age of EOP. A summation of the two groups suggests that both experience similar problems and adjust accordingly. The pattern, however, of Specials being slow to start, then gradually "catching up," seemed to prevail in this area.

(3) Social Adjustment. Perceptions held by the interviewees relative to the ability of Special Admits and General Admits from similar socio-economic backgrounds to successfully adjust socially to the college environment mirrors a concept very closely related to the foregoing areas of performance. Ratings tended to cluster about the center, but a distinct pattern of extra progress is reflected on a year-to-year basis for Special students. For example, each of the first three years received two judgments of "somewhat lower" for Specials, but only one the fourth

210

year and none for the final year, 1971. Special Admits received one judgment each of "somewhat higher" the first two years; two such ratings the third year. By 1971, all rathings were given to "about the same," except two individuals who perceived the Special student as being "somewhat faster" or "decidedly faster" at making the social adjustment to college life. As noted, there were several "no opinions" registered at San Francisco State and at least one each at U.C., Berkeley and San Jose State. Qualifying statements from interviewees suggested that the Special student tends to find it more difficult to make the social and academic adjustment the first year of his college experience, but subsequently catches up and generally surpasses his counterpart by or during his senior year. Scholars are cautioned to remember that these two groups represent the same basic socio-economic strata of our society.

(4) Adjustment to Academic Rigors. Summarizing this section mirrors a collective judgment depicting a more difficult task for the average Special Admit to effectively adjust to the academic arena. Here, it was heard that such students often leave incompletes "hanging" over a much longer period of time. The ratings tended to cluster around column two, representing one full level below the middle for Special Admits. It was, however, noted that most of the relatively low ratings given Special students were recorded during the first three or four years. Each of the last three years one respondent rated Specials above the General group at San Jose State. All ratings registered at U.C., Berkeley were "about the same" for both groups, and continually two "no opinions" were recorded at San Francisco State. All other judgments at San Francisco State were

"even" except one rating of "somewhat lower" for Specials during 1971.

In sum, it can be said that excepted admissions students begin collectively with a much slower rate of academic adjustment, but gradually improve to the level of "almost but not quite the same" as General students from similar socio-economic backgrounds, as perceived by the interviewees.

(5) Dropout Rate. Again, as seen in Table VI-1, the perceptions administrators held regarding the dropout rate for these two groups of similar socio-economic class students is summarized by noting a very high dropout rate for excepted students during the first two years (1966-68). Following these two years, the collective ratings shift to an even split between "about the same" and "somewhat higher" or "lower" for Specials to a more even distribution of ratings for the last two years evaluated. The summated perceptions of these administrators tend to show that the dropout rate is continually higher for Special Admits over the other group, but that comparatively the differences decline over a period of years.

This summation supports what was heard in each institution at least once, that the dropout rate is very high initially for Special students but exhibits a propensity towards stabilization after a period of adjustment. An additional qualifying statement heard in this institution was that after the period of high dropout rates for Specials (first one or two years), the rate tends to drop considerably below that of both General students from similar socio-economic backgrounds and General students collectively. This judgment, however, was not always reflected on the rating form.

(6) Time Taken to Earn Degree. A summary of perceptions held by interviewees relative to the time taken to earn degrees by the two respective groups reflects a cluster about the center ("about the same"). One person held to "no opinion" at San Jose State and two such ratings were articulated at San Francisco State. One individual at U.C., Berkeley rated Specials slower, while all others rated the two groups even for each year. Cal State, Hayward registered several "longer" and "much longer" periods for Specials to earn degrees during the first four years. More opinions of "about the same" were noted in 1971 at Cal State, Hayward. One will note that the pendulum swings to and fro, but reflects a pattern which suggests that Special Admits require a somewhat longer period of study to earn degrees. But the present pattern of progress prevails for Special students relative to the General student from similar socio-economic background, as the former group is perceived by at least one interviewee to require decidedly less time to earn a degree by the last two years under study.

In qualifying the interviewees' knowledge of the progress of students subsequent to matriculation, it was observed that almost all respondents knew very little or had "some knowledge"; a few said "none." No interviewee saw himself as having "much" or "very much" knowledge about the progress of students after registration.

## Comparative Statement

Perceptions within the four institutions were similar in that the general pattern reflected a suggestion that Special Admits were collectively somewhat slower to about the same as General registrants who represented their social and economic peers. This seemed to be basically true in all of the six areas of performance researched. Within this general pattern, however, some differences in institutions can be observed. San Jose State differed somewhat in that opinions were scattered more broadly than any other with interviewees using the entire gamit to represent their responses. The uniqueness of Cal State, Hayward was marked by the lack of "no opinion" ratings, but a greater proportional cluster around the center, lower-center area of the continuum. "No opinion" marked the unusualness of the perceptions recorded at San Francisco State, as almost all ratings were either "no opinion" or "about the same." This left a responsive cluster near the center of the rating scale. More proportional judgments of "about the same" were recorded at U.C., Berkeley, with only minor variations which included a few ratings of "no opinion" and "somewhat lower."

## Summary of Part One

No records are kept in any of these institutions which identified the performance of Special Admissions students relative to that of General Admissions students from lower socio-economic backgrounds. Indeed, at least one respondent at U.C. Berkeley stated that "there is no such animal." It was this person's evaluation that "no" lower socio-economic student could be successful in that school without at least some aid provided by the EOP office. In the absence of recorded data, it seems safe to say that, overall, little difference is evidenced between the two groups. Two factors do tend to emerge. One, General registrants in this category seem to do better initially with the academic challenge. Two, Special Admits tend to drop out or "catch up" with those who persist maintaining a slightly better record of performance than their socio-economic counterparts by their senior year. This appears to be the case in each institution if Special Admits received sufficient financial, tutorial and counseling services.

## Part Two: Performance

Using the same model for evaluation as discussed in the first half of this chapter, part five of the data gathering instrument asked respondents their perceptions of the performance for Special Admits relative to General admits (all non-excepted admissions). What follows is a treatment of findings to this query, together with a comparison with available records.

The writer was interested in learning whether or not regular students from lower socio-economic backgrounds were perceived to perform better than all regulars in relation to the average performance of Special Admits.

### Analysis of Findings

In response to their knowledge of students' progress after admission, no one replied "very much" or "much." Most persons replied "some"; others stated "very little," and a few assessed themselves as having "no knowledge" of students' progress. It was observed that most interviewees had some perception about the relative performance of the two groups, and only two at San Francisco State and one at U.C. Berkeley replied "no opinion." (See Table VI-2.) Again, the "no opinions" were followed with statements like, "There are no records to show this," and "nobody knows how this comparison is," or "nobody has this information."

(1) Grades Earned. As can be observed in Table VI-2, most evaluations tended to cluster about the middle and lower-middle portion of the scale. Several respondents at Cal State, Hayward and San Jose State rated Specials as earning decidedly lower or somewhat lower GPAs than General students during the first two years. One respondent at San Francisco State rated Specials as earning much higher grades, and one judgment at San Jose State was "somewhat higher" for Specials the last four years evaluated.

Collectively, perceptions were that Specials performed somewhat lower in grades earned. U.C., Berkeley, administrators, for example, split even between "about the same" and "somewhat lower." While some scattered apprizements were advanced, most developed the pattern of regular students tending to earn higher grades than Specials.

(2) Progress Toward Degree Requirements. An analysis of the perceptions reveals a pattern of progress favoring the General student in this area through the first three years rated. Mirrored here is a path of relative "catching up" on the part of Special Admits to the General student over the years. This was generally true in each institution. Most evaluators at San Jose State and Cal State, Hayward, rated Specials "lower" or "decidedly lower" than their counterparts the first three years, but the last two years were perceived as being "about the same" for each group. Again, one respondent at San Jose State rated Specials as "somewhat

TABLE VI-2

SUMMARY OF INTERVIEWEES' PERCEPTIONS OF THE AVERAGE PERFORMANCE FOR SPECIAL ADMISSIONS STUDENTS RELATIVE TO THE AVERAGE PERFORMANCE OF GENERAL ADMISSIONS STUDENTS IN FOUR CALIFORNIA INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION

| Areas of Progress | Year | Decidedly Lower 1 |  |  |  | Somewhat Lower 2 |  |  |  | About the Same 3 |  |  |  | Somewhat Higher 4 |  |  |  | Decidedly Higher 5 |  |  |  | No Opinion 6 |  |  |  |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
|  |  | A | B | C | D | A | B | C | D | A | B | C | D | A | B | C | D | A | B | C | D | A | B | C | D |
| 1) Grades Earned | 1966-67 | 1 | 1 |  |  | 3 | 1 |  | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  | 2 |  |
|  | 1967-68 | 1 | 2 |  |  | 3 | 1 |  | 2 |  | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  | 2 |  |
|  | 1968-69 |  |  |  |  | 2 | 3 |  | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  | 2 |  |
|  | 1969-70 |  |  |  |  | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  | 2 |  |
|  | 1970-71 |  |  |  |  | 1 | 2 |  | 2 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  | 2 |  |
| 2) Progress Toward Degree Require-ments | 1966-67 | 1 | 2 |  |  | 3 |  | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 |  |
|  | 1967-68 | 1 | 2 |  |  | 3 |  | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 |  |
|  | 1968-69 |  |  |  |  | 2 | 2 | 1 |  | 3 | 2 | 2 | 4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 |  |
|  | 1969-70 |  |  |  |  | 1 | 2 | 1 |  | 3 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 |  |
|  | 1970-71 |  |  |  |  | 1 | 2 | 2 |  | 3 | 2 | 1 | 4 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 |  |
| 3) Social Adjust-ment | 1966-67 |  | 1 |  |  | 3 |  | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 |  |
|  | 1967-68 |  | 1 |  |  | 3 |  | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 |  |
|  | 1968-69 |  | 1 |  |  | 2 |  | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 |  |
|  | 1969-70 |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 |  |
|  | 1970-71 |  |  |  |  |  | 1 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 |  |
| 4) Aca-demic Adjust-ment | 1966-67 | 2 | 2 |  |  | 2 |  | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 |  |
|  | 1967-68 | 1 | 2 |  |  | 3 |  | 1 | 2 |  | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 |  |
|  | 1968-69 |  | 1 |  |  | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 |  |
|  | 1969-70 |  |  |  |  | 1 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 |  |
|  | 1970-71 |  |  |  |  | 1 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 |  |
| 5) Dropout Rate | 1966-67 |  | 1 |  |  |  |  | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 |  |  |  | 1 | 1 |  |  |  | 2 | 1 |
|  | 1967-68 |  | 1 |  |  | 1 |  | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 |  |  |  | 1 | 1 |  |  |  | 2 | 1 |
|  | 1968-69 |  |  |  |  | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  | 2 | 1 |
|  | 1969-70 | 1 |  |  |  | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 |  |  | 2 | 3 | 2 | 1 |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  | 2 |  |
|  | 1970-71 | 1 |  |  |  | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 |  | 1 | 3 | 1 | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 |  |
| 6) Time Taken To Earn Degree | 1966-67 | 1 | 1 |  |  | 3 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 |  |
|  | 1967-68 | 1 | 2 |  |  | 3 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 |  |
|  | 1968-69 |  | 1 |  |  | 2 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 |  |
|  | 1969-70 |  | 1 |  |  | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 |  |
|  | 1970-71 |  |  |  |  | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 4 | 2 | 1 | 3 |  | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 |  |

Source: Compiled from data gathered with Part Five of the Focused Interview Questionnaire, May, 1972.

higher the last two years.

While these years were characterized generally as having no special differences, almost all persons perceived Special Admits to be either "about the same" or "somewhat slower" than the general student populace (see Table VI-2). All respondents at U.C., Berkeley rated the two groups even the last three years, but the continued ratings of "somewhat lower" from other institutions tend to suggest that the average progress toward degree requirements is slower for Special Admits.

(3) Social Adjustment. Again, here the analysis shows a distinct separation between how the two groups were perceived the first two years and the last two years. Perceptions of the first two years were generally that Special students were either slower or "about the same" as others in their ability to socially adjust to the academic scene. The middle year (1968-1969) saw ratings as "lower," "about the same," and "somewhat higher" for one group's ability to adjust better than the other. The last two years ending June 1971 were perceived as being "about the same" for the two groups except for one interviewee who rated Specials over General students at San Jose State. Some interviewees were decidedly uncomfortable with this evaluation, giving responses like, "I do not know what social adjustment means." Others suggested that there were several levels of social adjustment, and that Specials tended to seek out and make satisfactory social adjustments within their own choices. As noted in Table VI-2, several respondents intimated that Special Admits encountered some difficulty in making desirable social contacts.

In sum, the perceptions clearly establish the concept that Special

Admits begin slower than regulars, but gradually make much needed social adjustment and tend to be nearly on a par with their peers before graduation.

(4) Adjustment to Academic Rigors. The general pattern of perceptions held by college administrators in this area suggests that the Special Admit on the average encounters greater difficulty in adapting to the academic environment. At least one interviewee at San Francisco State and Cal State, Hayward voiced a concern that Special Admits' tendency to leave unfinished course work "hanging" over a much longer period of time. While relative growth or gaining on their counterparts is evidenced by the ratings, most respondents held that Special students continued to be somewhat slower than the others in making this adjustment. Several persons at U.C., Berkeley and San Jose State characterized Special Admits as being on a par with others for these latter years.

(5) Dropout Rate. A broader spectrum is represented in this area than in any others which include ratings in each category. In aggregate, however, the perceptions clearly illustrate a pattern toward a given direction. Special students tend to drop out at a much higher rate than Generals the first two years, but their average ability to persist the last two or three years tends to catch up with or pass their counterparts. One interviewee at each San Jose State and Cal State, Hayward rated Specials as "decidedly higher" in dropout rates the first two years over Generals, but the last two years one interviewee rated Specials as "decidedly lower" than Generals. A considerable portion of "somewhat lower" dropout rates were registered in each institution for each of

the years recorded.

(6) Time Taken to Earn Degree. Characterizing this analysis, is the fact that perceptions show Special students tending to continually take more time to earn the degree than others. The first years (1966-1968) received ratings of "decidedly longer," "longer," and "about the same," with several ratings being "longer." While most estimates rated no difference for the years 1969-1971, one interviewee remained adamant that Special students took "longer" at Cal State, Hayward. Again, general growth or "catching up" can be seen by studying Table VI-2; it can be seen that Specials were consistently rated as requiring a somewhat longer period of time to complete degree requirements.

## Summary

In summarizing the perceptions held by administrators interviewed at San Jose State, it can be said that different educators have different views, and the following conclusions are drawn:

1. Different educators have varying perceptions about the performance ability of Special and General students at each institution.
2. At San Francisco State respondents estimated that a significant portion of SAS were caught in the crossfire, confrontations and campus strife during and immediately after the strike.
3. While these perceptions differ individually, they tend to form a distinct pattern in most of the six areas judged.
4. Dropout rates drew the broadest dispersion of perceptions,

including ratings covering the entire scale.

5. Each of the six areas judged showed some similarities and differences in individual and collective perceptions.
6. In most of the six areas of performance, perceptions and qualifying statements suggested that Special Admits began college with definite disadvantages and function accordingly the first one or two years (or drop out), but normally catch up or possibly even excell their peers by their senior year.

Summary of Available Reports

The Ad Hoc EOP Evaluation Committee at San Jose State prepared a report for the year 1968-1969 which concluded with the following findings regarding the Black EOP. (Black and Mexican American EOP operated separately in this school.)

1. Approximately 20 percent met academic requirements for regular admissions and only participated in the EOP program for the purpose of securing financial aid.
2. Of 200 students who began the program in the fall of 1968, three-quarters or about 75 percent were registered by the end of the spring semester. The rate of returnees was somewhat higher among non-freshmen (80 percent), but lower among transfer freshmen (70 percent).
3. Only 10 percent of students who were "clear" at the end of fall semester failed to register for spring semester.
4. About 70 percent of registrants were "clear" at the end of fall semester, and this proportion remained about the same throughout the year.

5. Students attempted an average of 13.05 units and compiled an average GPA of approximately 2.38 during fall semester. Spring semester witnessed this group attempting an average of 12.9 units and earning an average GPA of 2.40.
6. Six percent withdrew during the fall and five percent followed them during the spring.
7. Twenty-four percent were on probation by the end of fall but only 14 percent were in this category with the closing of spring semester, 1969.
8. Three students or 1.5 percent were disqualified during fall semester and 12 registrants, or six percent, were so classified with the termination of spring semester.

Table VI-3 summarizes the disqualifications of students by class level for three categories of students: 1) non-EOP, 2) Black, and 3) Mexican Americans. What can be noted in this table is that Mexican American freshmen had the highest disqualification rate, with 14 students out of 166 for 8.4 percent. Blacks had the highest rate of disqualification among the sophomores, with three out of 23, for 8.1 percent. Non-EOP or general students retained a consistency of 2.5 or 2.4 percent disqualification for all four classes, while Mexican Americans had no sophomores or seniors disqualified. Blacks show no disqualifications for juniors or seniors.

A summary of the performance of Mexican American EOP students, as reported by the Ad Hoc Committee, also included the information below:

1. Of 247 students registered during the fall, about three-quarters were still in school at the end of spring semester.

## TABLE VI-3

## SPRING SEMESTER DISQUALIFICATION BY CLASS LEVEL AT SAN JOSE STATE, 1969

| Class | Enrolled | Disqualified | % Disqualified |
|---|---|---|---|
| FRESHMEN | | | |
| Non-EOP | 2055 | 51 | 2.5 |
| Black | 141 | 9 | 6.4 |
| Chicano | 166 | 14 | 8.4 |
| Total | 2362 | 74 | 3.1 |
| SOPHOMORES | | | |
| Non-EOP | 2227 | 54 | 2.4 |
| Black | 37 | 3 | 8.1 |
| Chicano | 23 | 0 | -- |
| Total | 2287 | 57 | 2.5 |
| JUNIORS | | | |
| Non-EOP | 5576 | 98 | 1.8 |
| Black | 24 | 0 | -- |
| Chicano | 34 | 1 | 3.0 |
| Total | 5634 | 99 | 1.8 |
| SENIORS | | | |
| Non-EOP | 6476 | 167 | 2.5 |
| Black | 1 | 0 | -- |
| Chicano | 0 | 0 | -- |
| Total | 6477 | 167 | 2.5 |

Source: Report of the Ad Hoc EOP Evaluation Committee, San Jose State College, for 1968-1969 (an unpublished document), June, 1969.

More than 30 percent met the General Admissions criteria. The Dean of Admissions was quoted as stating that approximately 48 percent of all freshmen General Admissions students returned the second year. This had been the case as late as 1964, the Dean reported.

2. Only about eight percent of "successful" fall students failed to register for the spring semester.
3. About half (50 percent) of all students were on probation at the end of fall semester, but this figure dropped to about 15 percent during the spring semester.
4. Those students who met requirements for General Admissions earned higher grades than those specially admitted and transferred students earned better grades than freshmen.
5. Collectively, the students attempted an average of 9.06 units and earned an average 1.86 GPA for fall, 1968, but attempted an average of 11.4 units during spring and compiled an average GPA of 2.28.

By comparison, we note that Black students attempted slightly more units and earned a slightly higher GPA than did Mexican Americans. Table VI-4 shows a comparison of academic status between Blacks and Mexican American EOP participants for the academic year 1968-1969. Numbers and percents are listed in four areas of progress: clear, withdrew, probation, and disqualified.

A Summary of August 15, 1970 EOP Report to the Coordinating Council for Higher Education reported the information below for this school. This report was made by randomly sampling 20 percent of the EOP students who

## TABLE VI-4

## COMPARISON OF ACADEMIC STATUS BETWEEN BLACK AND CHICANO EOP, FALL AND SPRING SEMESTER, 1968-69 AT SAN JOSE STATE

### FALL 1968

| | Black | | Chicano | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | N | % | N | % |
| Clear | 143 | 71 | 115 | 47 |
| Withdrew | 6 | 3 | 16 | 6 |
| Probation | 48 | 24 | 109 | 44 |
| Disqualified | 3 | 2 | 7 | 3 |
| Total | 200 | | 247 | |

### SPRING 1969

| | Black | | Chicano | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | N | % | N | % |
| Clear | 152 | 75 | 135 | 60 |
| Withdrew | 10 | 5 | 6 | 3 |
| Probation | 29 | 14 | 67 | 30 |
| Disqualified | 12 | 6 | 15 | 7 |
| Total | 203 | | 223 | |

Source: Report of the Ad Hoc EOP Evaluation Committee, San Jose State College, for 1968-1969 (an unpublished document), June, 1969.

did not meet admissions requirements. Samples were drawn from three groups of students: those who had completed less than 30 semester units, those completing fewer than 60 units, and those completing more than 60 semester units. Mean GPAs were compared for Special students and General admits.

1. Group one showed a mean GPA of 2.15 for Specials and 2.30 for General admits.
2. Indicated in group two was a mean GPA of 2.67 for Specials and 2.55 for Generals.
3. Mean GPAs for the two groups in the third category was 2.35 for Specials and 2.54 for Generals.
4. The mean GPA for all students was 2.38.

This information was compiled for 18 California State Colleges. Appendix VI shows the completed tables for comparison of institutions within the CSC system.

The testing office compiled data on the Black EOP covering the period 1968 to 1970, and salient aspects of the results are presented below.

> Although current comparative data on non-EOP students are not readily available in a compatible form, at least one series of useful comparisons can be made--between the EOP students who met the regular standards for admission to San Jose State College and those who did not meet the regular standards and were admitted as special students. Furthermore, it is our opinion that the EOP results by themselves shed considerable light on the success of the program. The results are presented below:
>
> (1) Of the Black EOP students who began at San Jose State College in September 1968, approximately two-thirds were enrolled two years later in June 1970 or had graduated. Of those who were still enrolled, the vast majority had clear status--only one out of five was on probation.

(2) The group of Black EOP students who met the regular admissions standards of the California State College System showed little or no advantage over the specially admitted EOP students with regard to the criteria discussed under (1) above.

(3) Not only were the majority of the two-year group still around, but they appeared to be progressing toward their Baccalaureate degrees. Almost two-thirds (62 percent) of those who entered in September 1968 had increased their class level by at least one year (e.g., freshmen to sophomores) over the two year period and approximately one-quarter increased their class levels by two years.

(4) In the one-year group--those who entered in September 1969 --the attrition rate was amazingly low. Of this group, 95 percent completed the spring semester 1970, and four out of five of these had clear status (i.e., were not on academic probation). Furthermore, almost one-half (46 percent) of the one-year group increased their class levels by one year over the period September 1969-June 1970.

(5) Examination of the course-load data indicates that the majority of the Black EOP students were full-time students during the academic year 1969-70. During the Fall of 1969, 58 percent carried full-time loads, and during the Spring of 1970, 64 percent carried full-time loads.

(6) Examination of the grade point average data for the Fall semester 1969 and the Spring semester 1970 indicates that roughly three out of four of the Black EOP students were doing satisfactory work (i.e., GPA of 2.00 or better). Furthermore, approximately one out of five achieved a "straight B" (i.e., 3.00) or better.

(7) Although one out of four was able to achieve a C average (i.e., 2.00), only one out of ten seemed to be in extremely serious academic difficulty (i.e., GPA below 1.50).[1]

Tables VI-5 and VI-6 show the academic status of Black EOP students who entered Fall (Table VI-5) 1968, and Fall (Table VI-6) 1969 as of June, 1970. Statistics include figures for regular (students registered with EOP who met General Admissions requirements) and Special students

---

[1] Dennis Hogan and Robert B. Clarke, Report on the Black EOP at San Jose State College--1968-1970 (San Jose, California, 1970), p. 2. An unpublished report made by the Testing Office.

## TABLE VI-5

## STATUS AT END OF SPRING 1970 OF THE BLACK EOP STUDENTS AT SAN JOSE STATE WHO ENTERED SJSC IN FALL 1968

| | ENTRY STATUS FALL 1968 | | STATUS AT END OF SPRING 1970 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | OUT OF SCHOOL | | | | IN SCHOOL OR GRADUATED | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | Freshman | | Sophomore | | Junior | | Senior | | | |
| | Class | N | W | Dq | NR | Total | Clear | Pro | Clear | Pro | Clear | Pro | Clear | Pro | Grad-uated | Total |
| SPECIAL | Freshmen | 120 | 14 | 15 | 12 | 41 | 2 | 2 | 38 | 18 | 18 | | 1 | | | 79 |
| | Sophomore | 33 | 1 | 4 | 11 | 16 | | | | 1 | 3 | 1 | 10 | | 3 | 17 |
| | Junior | 10 | | | | | | | | | | | 6 | | 4 | 10 |
| REGULAR | Freshman | 24 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 8 | | 3 | 4 | 2 | 7 | | | | | 16 |
| | Sophomore | 5 | | | | | | | | | 1 | | 2 | | 2 | 5 |
| | Junior | 8 | 2 | | 1 | 3 | | | | | | | 3 | | 2 | 5 |
| | Totals | 200 | 20 | 22 | 26 | 68 | 2 | 5 | 42 | 21 | 29 | 1 | 22 | 0 | 11 | 132 |

Note: Certain of the headings are defined below:

W withdrew from SJSC during a semester
Dq disqualified from continuing at SJSC because of poor academic performance
NR non-report, completed one or more semesters but did not report back to school the next semester
Clear not on academic probation; Pro on academic probation

Those students who fell in the OUT OF SCHOOL category left SJSC in the manner indicated some time during the period September 1968-June 1970 and had not returned as of June 1970.

Source: Hogan and Clarke, *op. cit.*

TABLE VI-6

STATUS AT END OF SPRING 1970 OF THE BLACK EOP STUDENTS AT SAN JOSE STATE
WHO ENTERED SJSC IN FALL 1969

| ENTRY STATUS FALL 1969 | | | STATUS AT END OF SPRING 1970 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | OUT OF SCHOOL | | | | IN SCHOOL OR GRADUATED | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | Freshman | | Sophomore | | Junior | | Senior | | | |
| | Class | N | W | Dq | NR | Total | Clear | Pro | Clear | Pro | Clear | Pro | Clear | Pro | Grad-uated | Total |
| SPECIAL | Freshman | 119 | 1 | 4 | | 5 | 46 | 22 | 39 | 6 | 1 | | | | | 114 |
| | Sophomore | 25 | | 2 | | 2 | | | 4 | 5 | 12 | 1 | 1 | | | 23 |
| | Junior | 14 | | 1 | | 1 | | | | | 2 | 1 | 8 | 2 | | 13 |
| | Senior | 1 | | | | | | | | | | | | 1 | | 1 |
| REGULAR | Freshman | 24 | | | 2 | 2 | 8 | 2 | 12 | | | | | | | 22 |
| | Sophomore | 6 | | | | | | | 1 | | 4 | 1 | | | | 6 |
| | Junior | 26 | | | 1 | 1 | | | | | 10 | 4 | 10 | 1 | | 25 |
| | Senior | 3 | | | | | | | | | | | 2 | | 1 | 3 |
| | Totals | 218 | 1 | 7 | 3 | 11 | 54 | 24 | 56 | 11 | 29 | 7 | 21 | 4 | 1 | 207 |

ote: Certain of the headings are defined below:

W withdrew from SJSC during a semester
Dq disqualified from continuing at SJSC because of poor academic performance
NR non-report, completed one or more semesters but did not report back to school the next semester
Clear not on academic probation; Pro on academic probation.

Source: Hogan and Clarke, op. cit.

for freshmen, sophomores, juniors and seniors. Broad categories of students' status are those "out of school" and those "in school or graduated." Students "out of school" were classified as withdrawn, disqualified, or no report; those "in school" were generally clear or probationary.

Table VI-8 indicates that the following students were in school as of June, 1970:

Two-thirds of the freshmen, about one-half the sophomores and all juniors classified as Specials from the Fall semester, 1968.

Regular students were characterized as having two-thirds freshmen, all sophomores and five-eighths of the juniors.

Of the total 200 students matriculating in Fall, 1968, 132 were still in school, of which eleven graduated; twenty-seven were on probation and the rest were "clear."

Of the 68 persons "out of school," 20 had withdrawn, 22 were disqualified for poor academic performance, and no report was given for the remaining 26.

Some improvement is noted with the summary of matriculants in Fall, 1969 (see Table VI-9). Two hundred eighteen students had enrolled and 207 were "in school or graduated" by June, 1970. Forty-six of the 207 students were on probation, of which most were either freshmen or sophomores. Only eleven individuals were "out of school," of which one had withdrawn, seven were disqualified for poor academic performance, and three were unaccounted for.

As reported in this research, almost all enrollees had attempted twelve or more units during each of the two semesters ending June, 1970, and indeed, 33 percent of the Specials and 41 percent of the Generals had attempted 15 or more units during Spring, 1970. Regulations in this institution consider 12 units a full-time study load. It was also noted that the number of units attempted included courses in which a grade of "F" or "failing" was received. Courses in which "incomplete" or "+" were received were not included in the number of units attempted.

The average GPA earned by Fall, 1969 continuing students was 2.28 for Specials and 2.44 for Generals. New students entering in the Fall of 1969 earned an average GPA of 2.45 and 2.50, respectively. Spring, 1970 saw the two groups earning an average GPA of 2.49 and 2.68, respectively.

Enrollment figures for Fall, 1970 were not available; consequently, no treatment can be made of data for the last academic year.

## Summary Statement

At San Jose State, it appears that research and opinions were closely related. Apparently, both Black and Mexican American EOP students, whether General or Special Admissions, are performing as follows when compared to the general student body:

1. Blacks are attempting slightly more units than Mexican Americans or the general student body, and earning higher grades than Mexican Americans, but probably somewhat lower than GAS, particularly the first one or two years and/or for freshmen and sophomores.

2. Both Black and Mexican American students are returning at a rate decidedly higher than the general student body.

3. Dropout rates appear to be decidedly higher for the ethnic

groups identified above during the years 1966-1968, and about the same as GAS during subsequent years.

4. Grades earned by juniors and seniors are probably equal to or better than Generals, but first-time freshmen are earning lower grades than GAS.

5. Almost all Black and Mexican American students receive some form of special assistance from the EOP office.

6. Progress toward degrees are probably equal to or slightly faster for Black students and equal to or somewhat slower for Mexican American students when compared to the general student body.

## Reports at Cal State, Hayward

The Counseling Office compiled information about the Special Admits in this school for the year 1968-1969. Their findings were that of 122 registrants in the Fall, the rate of retention was 73 percent by the end of June, 1969. Comparative data for SAS and GAS were gathered for freshman students only; however observation of Fall vs. Spring quarter GPAs within class-level indicated higher performances during the last quarter of the year. Freshman GPAs increased from 1.95 to 2.41, as sophomores increased from 2.07 during Fall to 2.37 during Spring. Upperclassmen witnessed a rise in earned GPA from 2.17 in the Fall to 2.53 in the Spring quarter. As noted at San Jose State, transfer students performed better than first-time freshmen. The comparative GPA between GAS and SAS revealed a 2.87 for Generals vs. 1.95 for Specials for Fall, and a three quarter cumulative GPA of 2.55 for Generals for the academic year vs. 2.12 for Specials.

"While large discrepancies still existed between SAS and regular admissions groups in terms of Fall quarter and cumulative GPAs, the mean performance of the SAS group was sufficiently high to suggest that the majority was successfully meeting minimum academic standards. The point is, had these SAS students been evaluated solely on the basis of their performance on admission measures, a great many of those who obviously coped satisfactorily would not have had the opportunity."[2] Table VI-7 shows the GPA ranges for first time Special Admissions students who entered Fall, 1968, by sex. Note that females tended to best their male counterparts in earning consistently higher grades. Eleven female students earned a GPA of 2.75 or better, while only five male students made this achievement. The second highest category was highlighted with females outperforming males by eight to five, or 12.5 percent to 9.6 percent in the 2.50 to 2.74 range.

A Preliminary Report on Use of Two Percent Exception Provisions in the California State Colleges for Fall, 1966 and Fall, 1967 reported that "The Coordinating Council on Higher Education reported that of 123 excepted students in this institution, 34 earned a "BELOW C" rating, 58 earned a "C" or better and four earned a "B" or better for the Fall quarter. Twenty-eight withdrew during the Fall but only two withdrew during Spring and one was disqualified for poor academic performance, Fall, while three were disqualified by the end of Spring.[3] This report

---

[2] Robert L. Trichero, and Morgan S. Stout, "Descriptive Academic Information Regarding the 1968-1969 Special Admissions Group at California State College, Hayward."(Hayward: California State College, October 1969), p. 7. Unpublished report prepared by the Counseling Office, Student Services Report #3.

[3] "Summary of Academic Performance, First Year Persistence, and

## TABLE VI-7

## GPA RANGES FOR FIRST-TIME SPECIAL ADMISSION STUDENTS WHO ENTERED HAYWARD STATE FALL QUARTER, 1968-1969

| GPA RANGES | Male |  | Female |  | Combined |  |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
|  | N | % | N | % | N | % |
| 2.75 and above | 5 | 9.6 | 11 | 17.2 | 16 | 13.8 |
| 2.50 - 2.74 | 5 | 9.6 | 8 | 12.5 | 13 | 11.2 |
| 2.25 - 2.49 | 7 | 13.5 | 8 | 12.5 | 15 | 12.9 |
| 2.00 - 2.24 | 11 | 21.2 | 12 | 18.8 | 23 | 19.8 |
| 1.75 - 1.99 | 6 | 11.5 | 3 | 4.7 | 9 | 7.8 |
| 1.74 and below | 8 | 34.6 | 22 | 34.4 | 40 | 34.5 |
| Total N | 52 |  | 64 |  | 116 |  |

listed 15 State Colleges, but gave no figures for San Francisco State.

By November, 1970, the Chancellor's Office had reported that the mean GPA for this college was 2.46 for Fall, 1969 EOP enrollees compared to 2.38 for San Jose State and 2.47 for San Francisco State.[4] These were EOP students who did not meet General Admissions requirements. For all EOP enrollees who had completed 20 or more semester units, the median GPA was 2.56 in this institution compared to 2.53 for San Jose State and

---

Disqualification of Fall 1968 EOP Enrollees in California State Colleges." (Los Angeles: The California State Colleges, Dec., 1969), Table ii. An unpublished document prepared by the Chancellor's Office.

[4] Office of The Chancellor, Annual Report on Educational Opportunity Programs. (Los Angeles: The California State Colleges, Nov., 1970), p. 19. Prepared for the Joint Legislative Budget Committee, Robert O. Bess, Director of Special Projects.

and 2.61 for San Francisco State. Seventy-eight percent of these EOP students earned a grade of "C" or better, and 14.7 percent earned a record of "B" or better. Seventy-five percent of those registering in the Fall, 1969 completed the academic year; 25 percent did not. See Appendix VI for comparison with other colleges. Also, 63.7 percent and 10.5 percent of first-time freshmen earned a record of "C" or "B" grades, respectively. Of the total transfer students, 84.6 percent earned "C" grades or better and 7.6 percent achieved "B" grades or better.

## Summary Statement

The scarcity of records limits what one may conclude about the performance of SAS and GAS at Hayward State. However, some note can be taken of the material just discussed, together with perceptions articulated which suggest that administrators are not far from relative accuracy in their collective estimates. As seen at San Jose State, Specials do tend to achieve a "slow start," which suggests some difficulty in initial adjustment to both the academic and social scene at the State College. The pattern continues unbroken of "catching up" and performing decidedly better after the first year. It seems apparent that all first-year EOP students encounter a need for a "period of adjustment" whether they be first-time freshmen, transfers or upper classmen. Perpetually, it seems, first-time freshmen encounter the greatest difficulties.

## San Francisco State

Few reports were available in this institution relative to the performance of either General or Special students at this time. An evaluation of the Step-Up Program, prepared in 1971 by its director, Al Townsel, stated that since the Step-Up Program began in the Fall of 1967 through Spring, 1971, the average cumulative GPA was 2.06. For the Spring semester, 1971, the apparent average GPA was 2.12, which indicated that 47 percent or 22 students of the group had GPAs of 2.5 or better, indicating that almost one-half of the group had a better than average college semester.[5] Six students received no credit for the Spring semester, and one student had a GPA of .80. The report suggested that the reasons for these poor performances were varied (i.e., emotional, personal problems), but concluded that such students often fail to properly withdraw from classes. Nine students achieved a GPA of 3.00 or better. The small excepted admissions program had graduated six students, two of which had a cumulative GPA of above 3.00; only one achieved a cumulative GPA of less than 2.60.

The institution's EOP office compiled the data shown in Table VI-8 for the period 1969 through 1971. This table indicates that of the 260 students enrolled Fall, 1969, 42 were on the Dean's list, 139 achieved a grade point average of 2.00 or better, 37 were on probation, 51 had withdrawn and one had graduated by June, 1971. Two hundred eighty-nine EOP students had registered Fall, 1970, of which 70 earned academic honors, 147 established themselves in grade "C" or better, only 35 were on probation, and none had graduated. From this short list, one can note some improvement between the two groups.

---

[5] Al Townsel, Evaluation of Step-Up Program: Academic Progress. (San Francisco: San Francisco State College, 1971), p. 1. An unpublished document prepared by the Director of the Program.

### TABLE VI-8

### EOP DEMOGRAPHIC DATA IN SAN FRANCISCO STATE FOR THE PERIOD 1969 THROUGH 1971

| Quarter | Total | Dean's List | G.P.A. 2.0-3.0 | Probation | With-drawn | Grad-uated |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Fall 1969 | 260 | 42 | 139 | 37 | 51 | 1 |
| Fall 1970 | 289 | 70 | 147 | 35 | 37 | 0 |
| Fall 1971 | 217 | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |

Source: Prepared by the EOP office at San Francisco State and released to the researcher by the Office of Institutional Research, 1972 (an unpublished report).

The summary of academic performance for California State Colleges, a report cited earlier, showed no statistics for this institution, but another report (also cited earlier) included the following information regarding Special Admits. Twenty-one percent of students who had completed fewer than 30 semester units were randomly selected. The mean GPA was 2.44 for Specials and 2.75 for regular students. A second similar number of samples from students completing less than 60 semester units revealed a mean GPA of 2.68 for Specials and 2.75 for Generals. The third like sample yielded a GPA of 2.31 for Specials, and 2.91 for Generals. The last group were students who had completed 60 or more semester units. Note that in this report, General students in this institution out-performed consistently other schools used in this study and also the other California State Colleges with respect to grades earned.

## Summary Statement

Given the lack of several records showing performance of Generals and Specials, it could be pure speculation to venture too far in making comparative statements about the performance of the two groups. It seems clear, that with a greater demand by students to enter this institution, both groups are probably out-performing their respective counterparts in other like institutions. Indeed, the Director of EOP stated during data gathering that beginning Fall, 1970, almost all Specials met the regular admissions criteria and participated in EOP activities for special services, most of which were financial aid. As cited earlier, campus strife, confrontations, and disruptions occurring between 1968 and 1971 at San Francisco State caused severe academic wounds to large numbers of ethnic minorities including excepted admissions students.

## U.C., Berkeley

Undergraduate Economic Opportunity Program for 1968-1969, first draft prepared by the President's Office, revealed that 1705 General admits were admitted, 52 EOP regular freshmen and 66 EOP Special action admittees in Fall, 1968. The average GPA earned by the three groups were: General admits - 2.81, General EOP - 2.25, and EOP Special actions - 2.05. From 1966, when the EOP first began in this school with 100 students, until 1969, a total of 140 Bachelor Degrees had been awarded to this Special group. In 1968, 36 were granted, as compared with 87 awarded in 1969.[6]

---

[6] Undergraduate Economic Opportunity Program, 1968-1969 (Berkeley:

By the end of 1969-1970, the following information had been compiled in this institution:

1. First-time freshmen witnessed 83 regular EOP students earning 2.71 GPA, and 117 Special action students earning 2.44 GPA.

2. Lower division transfers were found to have 15 regular EOP students earning a recorded 2.61 GPA, while Specials in this category earned a 2.65 GPA.

3. Upper division regulars achieved a 2.80 median GPA, with 70 students and 54 special action students so classified gaining a median GPA of 2.45. This information was for new EOP students.

Students who completed Spring quarter achieved the following levels:

1. One hundred twenty-four regularly admitted students registered a median 2.88 GPA, as 117 excepted admits polled a median of 2.66 in the class of continuing freshmen.

2. Continuing lower division transfers saw 16 regulars earn a median GPA of 2.98, and 196 excepted admits earned a median of 2.75.

3. Upper division transfers were characterized as including 49 regulars who compiled a recorded median GPA of 2.84, while 54 Specials accumulated a median GPA of 2.65.[7]

Studies demonstrate that students admitted in the EOP establish

---

University of California, September, 1969), p. 6. The Office of the President, an unpublished document.

[7] Item for Information (Berkeley: The University of California, Office of the President, 1971), attachment d to A Report Presented to the Committee on Educational Policy for a Meeting on January 20, 1971.

creditable records in the University. In general, academically eligible EOP students establish better records than students admitted by special action. This is not surprising; in the student body as a whole, students admitted by special action establish records somewhat less satisfactory than students who are academically eligible at the point of admission.[8]

The median grade point average for all university undergraduates, including EOP students, for academic year 1970-71, was 2.87 as compared to a median GPA for all University Educational Opportunity Program undergraduates of 2.56.[9]

### Summary Statement

While excepted students seem to be highly successful at this institution, General students and regulars within the EOP program consistently out-perform in grades earned. Freshmen students still seem to achieve a somewhat lower GPA than transfer lower division and upper division students. Over all, the perceptions articulated by interviewees were very close to what the records indicated. Sufficient information was not learned about the dropout rates for general or excepted students, and little can be said concerning their persistence.

## Chapter Summary

Generally, we have noted that perceptions held by interviewees were not far off from what available records indicated. Relative to General admits, Special enrollees begin slower, gradually catch up, and attain creditable records, but are not likely to out-perform General students whether from the greater student body or from the EOP ranks.

---

[8] *Item for Information* (Berkeley: The University of California, Office of the President, January, 1972), p. 2. A report presented to the Committee on Educational Policy for a meeting on January 12, 1972.

[9] *Ibid.*, p. 6.

# CHAPTER VII

## CONCLUSIONS: RESEARCH ASSERTIONS AND EXPECTATIONS REEXAMINED

1) Provisions under Special Admissions Programs will be in effect very little different from the General Admissions Policies.

It had been expected that provisions under Special Admissions Programs would be in effect very little different from General Admissions Policies. The California Master Plan for Higher Education had restricted the academic quality of students admitted to four-year institutions of higher learning. It was found that in fact some difference existed between provisions within the two structures for admissions. Perceptions of interviewees were (and records tended to agree) that grade point average, rank in high school graduating class, and scores on the ACT or SAT were waived for SAS. Limits were placed on GAS in that each registrant had to meet the regular admissions criteria (eligibility index). This index consisted of matching a grade point average with scores earned on the above-mentioned tests (see Chapter I).

The degree to which Special students could have matriculated before Special Admissions Programs (as suggested by Dr. William Jones of Stanford University, Chapter I) is not known. This determinant is particularly acute in that before Special Admissions Programs were initiated, excepted students were generally brought to the college to help win athletic events and/or because of other talents which contributed decidedly to the interest of the university. Theodore Newcomb's comment about "expanding admissions policies" does seem to apply here, if for no other reason than the two percent excepted rule which was initiated in California State Colleges and Universities during the late 1960's. This rule provided that two percent of all students admitted to such institutions could be less than "qualified" for admittance. It was this provision which constituted the framework within which SAS and lower socio-economic students were allowed to enroll. While SAS did not initially meet the regular criteria, they were, however, expected to have good character as exemplified by letters of recommendation from representatives of two or more groups from an approved list. (See Appendix I.) In effect, as noted earlier, the admissions standards tended to be a "trade-off" in which SAS traded lack of a superior academic record for good letters of reference, impressive interviews and/or other qualities which college administrators could use to predict successful college experience.

The Carnegie Commission stated that the American system of higher education had always been an "open" system and that there had been a place at some college for everyone who wanted to go and could afford to do so.[1] Professor Mayhew's statement about the Liberal Arts Colleges (Chapter I) suggested as much, but, we note in California, some restrictions are placed upon who attends public senior colleges.

---

[1] Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, Clark Kerr, editor, A Chance to Learn (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1970), p. 1.

Our expectation here was not entirely fulfilled, particularly for the first two or three years, since most of the "Special Admits" did not meet regular admissions requirements. By 1970-71, more and more Special Admits were qualifying for general admission in each institution studied. This was true because a much greater number of students vied for the slots allocated to Specials in each school. While the California Coordinating Council for Higher Education employed the term "special" to denote all students registered with EOP,[2] the respective EOP officers in each institution studied preferred to label those students who registered with their office but met the regular admissions criteria as "generals." Students qualifying for this category were those who only registered with EOP in order to secure financial or other assistance. The definition of an EOP or Special student tended to change slightly during the five years studied. The shift went from "minority ethnic students who failed to meet regular admissions criteria" to "any student who required one or more services provided by the EOP." What we have noted is that the original emphasis on "providing more opportunities in higher education for ethnic minorities" has moved into the "socio-economic spectra for all students." And indeed, according to some interviewees, the EOP serves more and more to limit the number of ethnic minority students (subsequent to 1970) since several Blacks and Mexican-Americans who meet the regular criteria are forced to register with EOP in order to secure much needed financial aid. This, in turn, limits the number and type of students in the state colleges and universities.[3]

---

[2] California State Colleges, Report of the University of California Undergraduate Educational Opportunity Program for the Academic Year 1969-1970 (Los Angeles, CA: Office of the Chancellor, January, 1971), p. 3. An unpublished document.

In sum, we note that this expectation only partially materialized. We must add, however, that the findings from this investigation suggest that the cycle describing a Special Admit seems clearly returning to the basic definition of a regular admit with one exception: "the student needs economic help."

This formidable "cycle" appears inimical to the original concept of Special Admissions Programs, since its emphasis becomes increasingly focused upon the poor student. This poor student may be of any ethnic group, and indeed one EOP was characterized as having 20 percent white students (Hidden Talent Project Report 1969, Sonoma State College). Certainly, all students should have the opportunity to earn a higher education, but some concern is expressed here as to whether or not the original objectives of Special Admissions Programs can be met as the "cycle" continues.

At San Francisco State, the geographical recruitment area for EOP had been restricted to the immediate city, suggested the director. This was done due to the increased competition for the few slots reserved for Special Admits. The Dean of Admissions and Records at Sonoma State stated that his school was forced to turn down or refer elsewhere more than 2,400 applicants due to lack of space. He also observed that

---

[3] Peter Schrag, "Open Admissions to What?" in Open Admissions and Equal Access. Ed. by Philip Rever. (Iowa City, Iowa: The American Council Testing Program, 1971), pp. 48-53.

Fall, 1972 would mark the first year that the enrollment ceased to expand. In April, 1972 he stated that budgetary constraints would again prevent expansion in 1973. Thus, it appears that budgetary limitations will go far in determining who has the opportunity to earn a higher education in California's senior institutions of higher learning.

2. Specific variations and provisions employed with the expressed purpose of recruiting and educating more students with minority ethnic identity tended to be temporary and without lasting significant impact.

A second assertion and expectation was that provisions expanded with the expressed purpose of recruiting more students with ethnic minority identity tended to be temporary and without lasting impact. As noted in previous pages, more students from lower socio-economic strata of our society representing all ethnic groups in America are competing for college slots. This expectation seemed to be decisively apparent in each institution researched.

It appears clear to this investigator that the broad definition of an EOP student by the Coordinating Council of Higher Education had at least partially the intention of limiting the number of Blacks and Mexican-Americans in senior institutions. Thus, Fred Crossland's statement about increased minority enrollment being more of a response to, rather than a cause of persistent pressures for campus change, seems appropriate. Also, Harry Edwards' suggestion in Black Students, 1970, that the mere presence of new, visible, and different groups made it vulnerable to simplistic charges that somehow it was responsible for the end of academic tranquility. The potency of the latter statement typifies conceptions permeating efforts to expand educational opportunities to more oppressed people in America. Research suggests clearly to this writer that colleges and universities are in error when they attribute a disproportionately high percentage of campus unrest to the presence of a few Blacks and Mexican-Americans. This fear seems to inhibit college administrators in their attempts to serve "new students," and this somewhat ill-guided misconception seems to effect attitudes of "go slow" when recruiting them.

At least one interviewee in each institution voiced concern over the budgetary constraints for effective EOP programs, and followed with statements supporting the concept that limits were being placed upon the quality and type of prospective entrants. For example, several persons expressed concern in one institution about the fact that "no strong, outspoken minority student leader" could be recruited under the present system which seeks to "screen out" these individuals. This, suggests the interviewees, had been brought on with "minor state financial support for EOP" beginning in 1969. As observed before, in Admissions of Minority Students in Midwestern Colleges (see Chapter I), interviewees tended to be adamant in their evaluation of limits being placed upon the numbers of minority student enrollees. Respondents to this research felt that the state became keenly interested in determining this factor and less committed to expanding educational opportunity.

Clearly, we have noted that financial constraints support limited minority enrollment, just as cited at Antioch, CUNY, North

Dakota and other institutions. It is conceivable that some readers would suggest that Roger Heyn's comment (Chapter I) applies here, since ethnic minorities continue to experience formidable financial difficulties. One respondent stated, "We do not use all of our Special Admissions slots," and, when asked to elaborate, made no further response. Another respondent stated, "We secured more financing for EOP, but the Director of Financial Aid wants to reserve it for non-EOP students." Another case was one in which the interviewee repeated several times, "There is a gradual retrenchment on the part of both the state and this college. They really do not want many ethnic minorities here." Hence, I would conclude that the attitudes, perceptions, opinions, and judgments of college administrators affect the outcome and effectiveness of EOP and other Special Admissions Programs. One effect of an unfavorable attitude by administrators can be the limiting of new students and the quality of services rendered.

This investigator feels that the findings support the stated expectation in the sense that the numbers of ethnic minority registrants tended to level off in each institution by the school year 1970-71. These figures represented significant increases over the paucity of such enrollees before 1966; however, the "leveling off" plateau was not significant when considering (1) the expanded enrollment, and (2) the proportional regional ethnic population of the several institutions.

Readers may wish to add to this component the "expectations" by minorities. Campuses became inundated with requests for ethnic studies, curriculum relevancy (see Norvel Smith, 1969) and other demands due to isolation and loneliness, which increased pressures on higher education.

> . . . Many of the programs have largely been political responses to recently increased pressures from Blacks and other minority groups for inclusion in all phases of the mainstream of life and society. At this period, however, other pressures are competing insistently with the moral claims of disadvantaged groups. Money available for such innovative programs has decreased, or at least seems frozen at past levels. Preoccupation with the war and the exploitation of the environment has occupied a good deal of the moral energy of those who might be expected to be concerned with the problem.[4]

3) The average GPA earned by students admitted under Special Admissions Programs equalled the average GPA earned by the general student body.

The third research expectation was that Special students earned GPAs equal to those of General admits. Veterans out-performed non-veterans in every area of judgment in a dissertation recently completed by Dr. Paul Holmes, President of Alameda College, Oakland, California. This group has sometimes been referred to as "non-traditional college types." Dr. Holmes' study (Stanford University, 1968) included GPAs and number of units successfully completed for a period of one year. Sidney Sulkin had noted that the GPAs earned by Blacks were about average, which was about what this research learned, except that Special Admits did not tend to earn a GPA equal to that of regular admits.

Indeed, first-time freshmen Specials tended to earn much lower

---

[4] Edmund W. Gordon, "Programs and Practices for Minority Group Youths in Higher Education," in Barriers to Higher Education (New York: The College Entrance Examination Board, 1971), p. 112.

GPAs than regulars, while upper classmen and transfer students (Specials) continued to earn an average GPA somewhat lower than that of General admits. This determinant was found to be true both in available records and evaluations of interviewees. At odds here are the findings at Stanford University for 1968-1970 in which the task force reported Special students earned about the same GPA as Generals. Black administrators and students at Stanford suggest, however, that this group of Specials was highly qualified and would have performed equally as well in any institution, and that in no way were these students "high risk."

Benjamin and Powell's research at CUNY suggested that a significant number of high risk students were capable of earning satisfactory progress in higher education, but their conception did not go so far as to predict that their progress would equal that of non-Specials. This was found to be true during this investigation. We may, however, consider the findings of Seymour C. Hyman, who reported that ethnic minorities took better advantage of City University's open admissions than did whites in 1970. It must be remembered that various ethnic groups are represented in both General and Special classifications, but the greater proportion of Black and Mexican-American students are enrolled as Special Admits. Thus, this research did not reveal a pattern suggested by Mr. Hyman. Report of EOP in California State Colleges for 1969-1970 stated that nearly 71 percent of excepted registrants had performed satisfactorily by earning an average GPA of 2.00 ("C") or better. This average, however, did not equal the averages reported for Generals in the same report.

This research found that, on the average, the GPA earned by Special Admits was somewhat lower to decidedly lower than that earned by non-Specials. Again, this is not to say that Specials do not perform well in senior institutions of higher learning in California. Indeed, the record is very impressive when given the particular difficulties and disadvantages these registrants have experienced before and during their academic tenure on campus. The difference in average grades earned seems to be less when transfers and upper classmen are compared, interviewees suggest. It was perceived, however, that Specials classified as seniors earned an average GPA equal to or greater than their counterparts. This proportional number was small, and would not offset the much greater influence of freshmen and other lower classmen.

It was learned that students meeting the regular admissions criteria but also registered with the EOP office earned consistently higher GPAs than did other excepted students. Should these students be considered, it appears that their GPA is approximately the same as non-Specials. What the data seem to suggest is that lower socio-economic students perform at approximately the same rate as other General Admissions students, provided they receive needed counseling, financial and tutorial assistance.

4) The average program and degree progress for Special Admits equaled the average program and degree progress of General Admits.

It was difficult to determine whether or not the average program and degree progress for Special Admits equaled the comparative data for Generals. This was research assertion and expectation number four. Few records were available which compared the number of units attempted by the two groups. Perceptions generally were that the average progress of Specials was about the same to somewhat slower than non-Specials. One respondent put it this way: "Special students tend to leave incompletes hanging for a much longer time than non-Specials." In the same institution was heard: "Specials tend to stay in school and persist at a higher proportional rate than non-Specials if they receive adequate financing. Regulars drop out, transfer, or tune out society altogether at a rate much higher than special students." Again, we note that administrators had different perceptions about the quality and dedication of excepted students. To some degree it can be said that both these comments tended to apply. The type of student who would fall into the first category tended to drop out the first or second year, while those receiving sufficient support tended to persist. (See Chronicle of Higher Education, February 14, 1972.)

Some data comparing Black and Mexican-American EOP students were available at one institution, which indicated that Blacks progressed at a higher rate than Mexican-Americans. This was true in GPA, number of units completed, dropout rate, and average number of students in "good standing" with the college. It is felt by this investigator that such data are relatively insignificant, particularly since records tended to show that Mexican-Americans were continuing to progress at a better rate in this school with each succeeding semester. Perhaps one item for consideration here is that Mexican-Americans could be suffering more than Blacks in their ability to secure a quality education in California high schools and junior colleges.

The Kitano Report had stated rather clearly that EOP students in California higher education were "generally" as successful as non-EOP students, as measured by both GPA achieved and rates of retention in their respective schools. It appears from this investigation that such a general statement merits closer examination. As cited earlier, using a broad interpretation of a Special student, it can be concluded that the Kitano Report is approximately correct. However, we have noted that certain qualifications should be evaluated and discussed when making a general statement relative to the comparative performance of EOP and non-EOP students. These particular qualifications have been cited earlier. The quality of Special Admits seems decidedly lower for 1969 and before, while those enrollees subsequent to this date seem to be more qualified academically and psychologically. Records at San Jose State and the State Chancellor's Office suggested rather strongly that SAS were performing much better for the last two years ending June, 1971. Dropout rates and units completed tended to equal or better non-EOP students. An admissions officer at San Jose State intimated that in 1964, about 44 to 48 percent of GAS freshmen students returned the following year. It was learned that the percent of SAS from 1969-1970 and 1970-1971 classes returned at a rate of approximately 67 percent. Indeed, this figure represented a much higher persistence rate than generally expected of regular students. Records for persistence rates involving non-EOP students were not available.

Considering the progress and upgrading in the quality of Special students after 1969, and more favorable persistence rates, higher GPAs and other factors previously discussed, it seems quite clear that comparative analysis tends to be seen as about even to slightly favoring the Special students. This seems to be particularly true when adequate financing and other needed supports are provided Special students.

In at least one institution, it was opined that Special Admits enrolled in a disproportionately high number of ethnic studies like western civilization, African civilization, etc. However, the State Coordinating Council reported for 1969-1970 that this performance factor was insignificant. Only one state college, reports the Council, was characterized by large numbers of EOP students enrolling in more than 40 percent of their study in ethnic studies. This school was not among those comprising the basic schools researched. The Council also reported that the average earned GPA for non-ethnic courses was approximately the same as the average GPA earned in ethnic studies. In sum, the findings tend to support the thesis that Special Admits admitted before 1969 progressed at a rate of somewhat slower to decidedly slower than General Admits, and, SAS admitted after 1969 and senior Specials tend to progress about the same to somewhat slower than General Admits.

## Review: Other Findings

Charles Z. Wilson in 1969 read a paper entitled "Recruitment, Academic Support, Financial, and Some Interrelated Considerations" to the American Personnel and Guidance Association in Las Vegas, Nevada. Mr. Wilson outlined the needs of higher education to become more actively involved in recruiting and educating Blacks and other oppressed peoples in America. Robert Fenske and Joseph Boyd had observed that 263 of 321 students, or 81.6 percent, would have selected a different college had they not been provided financial assistance by the Illinois State Scholarship Commission. Their research was not colored with Special or excepted admits, but involved general students. We have realized the need for greater financing (Chapter I) for higher education in general, and have observed that lower socio-economic students tend to require a greater amount of financial aid.

Perceptions were that excepted students performed much better when needed services were provided. In at least two schools, evaluators cited one or more years when adequate finances, counseling and tutoring were not provided. The results, report respondents, were disastrous. Special Admits had really fallen by the wayside, they added. Student strife, strikes, and campus turmoil seem to have also taken a severe toll among the ranks of EOP and Special Admits. For example, the opinion at San Francisco State was that ethnic minorities had suffered greatly during the confrontations and campus crises which lasted through 1969. It was also suggested that the aftermath was a chilling experience for EOP and all persons connected with the Special Admissions Programs. Reprecussions included cutbacks in funding support, limits on number of students EOP was allowed to recruit, severely limited services to students, including counseling and tutoring, and the geographical area for recruitment was limited to the immediate city and, more specifically, to one portion of the city, stated one observer.

It seems that each school had tried volunteer tutorial services, and each had expressed some dissatisfaction with the overall results. It was reported by respondents that better service in tutoring was experienced when tutors were paid. While financial remuneration was cited as the greatest single determinant to quality student services, other determinants surfaced. Interviewees voiced concern for the ability of some tutors to effectively relate to the tutored. This comment was heard in each institution, but seemed to be more acute in some schools. Several students who were in dire need of tutorial aid refused to seek it out for fear of being labeled "stupid," "dumb," or other less supportive names, judged the respondents. (See H. Rose and C. F. Elton, 1968.) Thus, we learned that the counseling and tutorial problems were not all financial, but emotional, psychological, social and cultural, as well. These findings compare favorably with those of D. G. Zyowski, 1963, William Williams, 1969, D. L. Trueblood, 1960, C. E. Vontress, 1969 and 1970, and others (see Bibliography).

## Identity Crisis

It appears to this investigator that an identity crisis was prevalent on each campus. This problem apparently runs the gamut from low self-esteem (see Carl Peterson, 1971; William Purkey, 1968; Cathleen Kubiniec, 1970, and Green and Zinkel, 1971) to feelings of isolation and cultural deprivation (see C. E. Vontress, 1969; Edwin Titus, 1969;

Gloria Scott, 1969; and William Purkey, 1969). Psychological and cultural factors seem to have been more intense on these campuses before 1970. After 1969, it appears that the sheer number of ethnic and lower socio-economic students enrolled in each school was sufficient to provide a measure of much needed comradeship. As one respondent said, "Special students and ethnic minorities are inclined to seek each other out and make social and psychological adjustments within their own group." An observed result of this seems to be small clusters of segregated students within an otherwise "integrated" institution. This component was particularly observed to be the case at Cal State, Hayward. Interviewees, both black and white, at this campus had voiced concern for the social, cultural, and psychological adjustment of ethnic minorities.

While San Francisco State seemed to be extending educational opportunity to the culturally oppressed at a slower rate of increase than the other schools, students there seemed to be more integrated socially and psychologically.

## Concluding Comment

In concluding, it can be said that some effort has been exerted by these California State institutions of higher learning to expand educational opportunity to more culturally and economically oppressed minorities. This investigation shows clearly that the number of ethnic and lower socio-economic students has increased on these campuses as a result of Special Admissions Programs. Most of this increase has been to date in lower class and freshman ranks. Appreciable numbers of ethnic and/or special graduates have not materialized to date.

Whether or not this increase in opportunity is worthy of commendation to higher education is highly suspect. At Sonoma State and Cal State, Hayward, the total enrollment had grown rapidly each succeeding year during the five years studied. Increases of Special and minority oppressed students also grew rapidly. Since the proportional number of students rose swiftly, serious questions remain as to whether or not the problem of educating economically oppressed students is being solved.

San Jose State and U.C., Berkeley also showed increases in ethnic minorities, but very little or no increase in total students after 1970. Records and perceptions mirrored a slight increase proportionally in Blacks and Mexican-American students in these two schools; however, this increase could barely qualify for more than "a good start."

Readers will note that this investigation was rather broad and involved. Records were scarce in the several institutions. In many cases this fact tended to impede the ability to secure bonafide perceptions from respondents about some questions. It is hoped that this research will provide some base from which others can take up the mantle. Indeed, there is a tremendous need to document America's expanding educational opportunity for the heretofore "non-traditional college types."

## Limitations of the Study

This study was limited by the small sample of schools (five public institutions of higher learning), by the number of persons interviewed (four or five in each institution), by the availability of records and by geographical location (a pre-requirement was that schools be located within 100 miles of San Francisco, California). The schools used in this study were four California State Colleges (two of which became State Universities by mid-1972) and the University of California at Berkeley. Included in the study were two institutions whose enrollments were rapidly expanding (Cal State at Hayward and Sonoma State at Rohnert Park), and two institutions which maintained relatively stable enrollments (San Francisco State and U.C., Berkeley). The other school, San Jose State, had experienced rapid growth during the last decade, but had apparently reached a stable plateau by 1970. Some comparative data for other senior California institutions of higher learning were compiled (see Appendices).

Further investigations which include schools with a much broader base could prove significant in determining the effectiveness of Special Admissions Programs and the equality of expanded educational opportunity beyond high school. The region from which the schools in this study were drawn included a wide range of ethnic population characteristics. It should be remembered, however, that different ratios of the various groups of people within our society would characterize other areas or different states within the nation. Subsequent researchers might consider using other proportions of ethnic mixes in their investigations.

As perceived by respondents, the impact of Special Admissions programs on General Admissions policies was not significant. In fact, some respondents in each institution suggested that these special programs had no real impact. Other evaluators within each school perceived a different sort of change, however, in the sense that more stringent policies, procedures and guidelines were established for selecting Special Admissions students after 1969. These measures included sponsorship by two state agencies authorized to nominate EOP candidates. (See Appendix II.)

It would be interesting to observe the initiation and progress of one specific Special Admission Program in one institution over a protracted period in order to learn in greater detail how that small group of excepted students would compare with General Admissions students. For instance, the Step-Up Program might be thoroughly investigated in one school using one or a combination of the determinants addressed in this study. The determinant(s) selected might then be used in assessing random samples from the general student body for comparative study.

The sample of schools and interviewees was too small to investigate in depth the quantity or quality of overall efforts to expand educational opportunity in higher education in California.

## Perceptions of College Administrators

A significant measure of the rationale for this study was predicated upon the thesis that the perceptions and attitudes of college administrators could enhance or impede the success of Special Admissions Programs. Since these persons are entrusted with the charge of executing provisions for recruiting and admitting Special students, their perceptions and attitudes regarding lower socio-economic and/or ethnic racial groups are important. For example, if an administrator possesses an unfavorable attitude or low evaluations of such persons, these are likely to be revealed in both (1) his actions in the recruitment of minority group students, and (2) his actions in securing or providing for much-needed support services. The "uncommitted" are those college administrators who have such attitudes and who do not actively support efforts to maximize educational opportunities for disadvantaged and oppressed people. These individuals also negate such opportunities by (1) their failure to insist that all "Special Admit slots" by filled by Special Admissions students, and by (2) using Special Admissions funds for "traditional college type" students.

The findings of this investigation suggest rather strongly that some administrators in each of the schools studied are not committed to expanding educational opportunities for the so-called "non-traditional college type." Without this commitment on the part of certain key officials, serious doubts remain as to whether significant progress in this area can ever be made.

## Value of Administrators' Opinions

Perhaps the greatest value of the opinions which college and university administrators hold towards Special Admissions Programs lies in the realization that these projects were designed to extend opportunities for minority ethnic groups to earn a higher education. The issue then becomes "how administrators perceive ethnic racial groups," and, more specifically, their opinions, concepts, evaluations and predictions regarding the ability of minority group students and lower socio-economic individuals to succeed in higher education.

We have noted in the public school section that the United States Congress and courts have outlawed the concept of unequal educational opportunity. Yet educational administrators have all too often been slow, reluctant or even obstructive in their efforts to provide equal educational opportunity for all students. This researcher feels strongly that much of this slack can be traced to administrators' opinions, perceptions and attitudes about different racial groups which inhibit and immobilize their ability to serve the entire public well.

Dr. Michael Kirst recently completed Federal Delivery Systems For Educating the Disadvantaged Child (1972) in which he states that money is often given to school districts without strict instructions on how it must be used. As a result, according to Dr. Kirst, many schools have utilized these funds to meet other priorities--priorities which too often did not include "educating the disadvantaged child." Unhealthy, undesirable, and low evaluations of the minority student by administrators generally result in less than equal educational opportunity, and the findings of this research suggest that this phenomenon is likely to continue.

## Implications for Policy Determination

1) Maximum use of the provisions for financing higher education as contained in the Higher Education Act of 1965, and Higher Education Amendments of 1968.

2) The securing of federal grants which provide extra manpower to render effective counseling and tutoring for Special Admits.

3) Standardization of procedures for documenting and comparing the performance of Special Admits and the performance of General Admits in California State colleges and universities.

4) Standardization of procedures for documenting the quality and quantity of financial, counseling and tutorial services rendered to both Special Admissions students and General Admissions students in California senior institutions of higher education.

5) For the next two to five years, standardization of procedures in documenting the identity of racial and ethnic characteristics of students and graduates.

Implications for Future Research

The questions emerging from the findings of this study which appear to merit further investigation include the following:

1) What were the comparative test scores and grades of General Admissions students and Special Admissions students entering as freshmen at a given state college, and how did their progress and development compare four years later?

2) Using a controlled group, how would the performance of General Admissions students who needed financial and/or other special assistance but did not receive it compare with the performance of Special Admissions students who received all special services required during one academic year.

3) What were the opinions, perceptions and evaluations of Special Admissions students by professors and teachers in the several state universities?

4) What perceptions and opinions do Special Admissions students have regarding Special Admissions Programs, and how have these opinions affected their academic performance at the universities?

## Recommendations

1) Open Admissions be practiced in all California State colleges, or at least in a select number located in key high density population areas such as the greater San Francisco Bay Area or Los Angeles.

2) The State of California institute a voucher system which would provide financial aid to all economically oppressed students. The dollar value of these vouchers would depend upon the need of each individual.

3) Federal grants be provided to supplement the dollar value of state vouchers to insure that each student has sufficient funds for living expenses and other basics related to schooling.

## Summary

This chapter has addressed the research assertions and expectations, findings, conclusions, limitations, value of administrator opinions, implications and recommendations. The research has provided additional information relative to Special and General Admissions. Determinants investigated were: 1) policies waived for Special Admits, 2) Special services provided students, i.e., financial, counseling and tutorial, and 3) the comparative performance of General and Special enrollees. Each of these components is pertinent to expanding educational opportunities. It would appear that this area is very important in making higher education viable for the last quarter of this century. Other researchers are encouraged to expand the task.

# BIBLIOGRAPHY

Adams, Arthur S., *et al.* *Higher Education for an Expanding Population.* Corvallis, Ore.: Oregon State University, 1954.

Allen, Hallis Patredge. *The Federal Government and Education.* New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1950.

Allen, Herman R. *Open Door to Learning.* Urbana, Ill.: University of Illinois Press, 1963.

Allen, James E., Jr., *et al.* *The Regents' State-Wide Plan for the Expansion and Development of Higher Education, 1964.* Albany, N.Y.: University of the State of New York, The State Education Department, 1965.

American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers. *An Adequate Permanent Record and Transcript Guide.* Washington, D.C.: American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers, 1965.

American Association of Universities. *Federal Financing of Higher Education.* Washington, D.C.: Association of American Universities, 1968.

American College Testing Program. *Research and Development Division - College Student Profiles.* Iowa City, Iowa: American College Testing Program, 1966.

American Council on Education. *College Testing*: A Guide to Practices and Programs. Washington, D.C., 1959.

Anderson, Robert A. *A Study of Possible Results of Limiting Enrollment at One California State College.* Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Stanford University, 1967.

Ashmore, Harry Scott. *The Negro and the Schools.* Chapel Hill, N.C.: University of North Carolina Press, 1954.

Astin, Alexander W. *Trends in the Characteristics of Entering College Students, 1961-1965.* Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1966.

________. *Who Goes Where to College?* Chicago: Science Research Associates, 1965.

Babbidge, Homer D., Jr. and Robert M. Rosenzweig. *The Federal Interest in Higher Education*. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1962.

Barron, Milton L. *Minorities in a Changing World*. New York: Alfred F. Knopf, 1967.

Benson, Charles S. *The Cheerful Prospect*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1965.

________. *The Economics of Public Education*. 2nd ed. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1968.

Best, John W. *Research in Education*. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1970.

Bowles, Frank, *et al.* *How to Get Into College*. 4th rev. ed. New York: Dutton, 1968.

Brombaugh, A. J. *Research Designed to Improve Institutions of Higher Learning*. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1960.

Brubacker, John B. and Willis Rudy. *Higher Education in Transition, 1636-1968*. New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1968.

Brumbaugh, A. J. *State-Wide Planning and Coordination of Higher Education* Atlanta: Southern Regional Education Board, 1963.

California Department of Education. *Projection of Enrollment in California Institutions of Higher Education, 1960-1975.* Master Plan Survey Team. Sacramento: 1960.

California Liaison Committee. *Master Plan for Higher Education in California, 1960-1975*. Sacramento: State Department of Education, 1961.

Cass, James and Max Birmbaum. *Comparative Guide to American Colleges, 1970-1971.* New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1971.

Cass, Patricia K. *Beyond the Open Door*, New Students in Higher Education. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1971.

Chambers, M. M. *Higher Education - The 50 States*. Danville, Ill.: Inter State Printers and Publishing Co., 1970.

Clark, Burton R. *The Open Door to College*. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1969.

Clark, Kenneth B. (ed.). *Racism and American Education*, A Dialogue and Agenda for Action. New York: Harper Colophon Books, 1970.

The College Board. First 50 Years. New York: Columbia University Press, 1950.

College Entrance Examination Board. A Chance to Go to College. New York: College Entrance Examination Board, 1971.

________. College Admissions: Planning College Policy for the Critical Decade Ahead. New York: College Entrance Examination Board, 1958.

________. College Admissions Policies for the 1970's. New York: College Entrance Examination Board, 1968.

________. Financing a College Education. New York: College Entrance Examination Board, 1969.

________. Manual of Freshmen Class Profiles, 1965-67. New York: 1967.

________. Manual of Freshmen Class Profiles, 1967-69. New York: 1969.

________. The College Handbook, 1963-65. New York: 1963.

________. The Great Sorting. New York: College Entrance Examination Board, 1955.

College Student Personnel Institute. Orientation. Claremont, CA.: College Student Personnel Institute, 1966.

Conant, James B. Shaping Educational Policy. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1964.

Condon, John Thomas. "Study Habits of California Community College Students." Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation. Stanford University, 1966.

Corbally, John E., Jr. School Finance. Boston: Allyn & Bacon, Inc., 1962.

Craig, W. Bradford. How to Finance a College Education. New York: Henry Holt & Co., Inc., 1959.

Crossland, Fred E. Minority Access to College. A Ford Foundation Report. New York: Schocken Books, 1971.

Cruse, H. Crisis in Academic Administration. New York: Apollo, 1968.

Davis, Helen E. On Getting Into College (A Study of Discrimination in College Admissions). Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1949.

Dobbins, Charles G. (ed.). *Higher Education and the Federal Government.* Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1963.

Doebler, Charles. *Who Gets Into College and Why*. New York: G.P. Putnam's Sons, 1965.

________. *New Measurements for Admission*. Providence, R.I.: Brown University Press, 1970.

Doermann, Humphrey. *Crosscurrents in College Admissions*. New York: T.C. Press, 1968.

Duggan, John M. *Predicting College Grades: A Computation Workbook for Estimating Freshman Grade Averages from High School Records and College Board Scores*. New York: College Entrance Examination Board, 1965.

*Equal Educational Opportunity*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1969.

Einstein, Bernice W. *College Entrance Guide*. New York: Grosset & Dunlap, 1968.

Estrada, Jacquelyn. *The University Under Siege*. Los Angeles: Nash Publishing Company, 1971.

Ferrin, Richard Irving. "An Analysis of the Changes in Free-Access Higher Education in the United States from 1958 to 1968." Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation. Stanford University, 1970.

________. *Barriers to Universal Higher Education*. Palo Alto, CA.: Access Research Office, College Entrance Examination Board, 1970.

Fleming, W. G. *The Use of Predictive Factors for the Improvement of University Admission Requirements*. Toronto, Ontario, Canada: Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, 1962.

Fowlkes, John Guy (ed.). *Higher Education for American Society*. Paper delivered at the National Educational Conference, Madison, 1948. Madison, Wisc.: University of Wisconsin Press, 1949.

Fuess, Claude M. *The College Board, Its First Fifty Years*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1950.

Gardner, John W. *Excellence: Can We Be Equal and Excellent Too?* New York: Harper Colophon Books, 1962.

Hartley, Joanne T. (ed.). *Dialogue on Higher Education*. Claremont, CA.: Claremont Graduate School, 1966.

Henderson, Algo D. (ed.). Higher Education in Tomorrow's World. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1968.

Higher Education for American Democracy: A Report of the President's Commission on Higher Education. New York: Harper & Row, 1948.

Hollingshead, B. S. Who Should Go to College? New York: Columbia University Press, 1952.

Hong, Howard. Integration in the Christian Liberal Arts College. Northfield, Minn.: St. Olaf College, 1956.

Hoyt, Donald P. and Leo Munday. Academic Description and Prediction in Junior Colleges. Iowa City, Iowa: American College Testing Program, 1966.

________. Your College Freshmen: Interpretive Guide to All Research Services for Higher Education. Iowa City, Iowa: The American College Testing Program, 1969.

Hutchins, Robert M. The Learning Society. New York: Praeger, 1968.

Jencks, Christopher and David Riesman. The Academic Revolution. New York: Doubleday & Co., 1968.

Jewett, James E. College Admissions Planning. Berkeley: University of California, Office of the President. An unpublished document under the Ford Foundation Program for Research in University Administration. November, 1971.

Kirst, Michael W. Delivery Systems for Federal Aid to Disadvantaged Children: Problems and Prospects. Occasional Papers in the Economics and Politics of Education. Stanford, CA.: School of Education, Stanford University, 1972.

________, (ed.). The Politics of Education. Berkeley, CA.: McCutchan Publishing Corp., 1970.

Knowles, Louis L. and Kenneth Prewitt (eds.). Institutional Racism in America. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1969.

Lemelle, Tilden J. and Wilbert J. Lemelle. The Black College. New York: Frederick A. Praeger, Publishers, 1969.

Lyon, Richard M. The College Decision: Issues for Undergraduate Thinking. Belmont, CA.: Brooks/Cole Publishing Co., 1967.

Mayhew, Lewis B. The Smaller Liberal Arts College. New York: Center for Applied Research, 1962.

Mayhew, Lewis B. Colleges Today and Tomorrow. San Francisco: Jossey Bass Co., 1969.

________. Higher Education in the Revolutionary Decades.

McCune, Shannon. The New College Plan: A Proposal for a Major Departure in Higher Education. Amherst, Mass.: Amherst University, 1958.

McGrath, Earl J. (ed.). Universal Higher Education. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1966.

Medsker, Leland L. and Dale Tilley. Breaking the Access Barriers. Berkeley, CA.: Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, 1971.

Miller, James L. State Budgeting for Higher Education. Formulas and Cost Analysis. Ann Arbor: Institute of Public Administration, University of Michigan Press, 1964.

Morgan, Gordon D. The Ghetto College Student. Iowa City, Iowa: American College Testing Program, 1970.

Morrison, Wilma. The School Record: It's Use and Abuse in College Admission. New York: College Entrance Examination Board, 1961.

Moore, William C. Against the Odds: The High Risk Student in the Community College. San Francisco: Jossey Bass, Inc., 1970.

Moynihan, Daniel P. Maximum Feasible Misunderstanding. New York: The Free Press, 1969.

National Association of College Admissions Counselors. Admissions Search Kit. Evanston, Ill.: National Association of College Admissions Counselors (Distributed by 3-M), 1968.

Nelson, Fred A. "California and Non Public Higher Education." Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation. Stanford University: School of Education, 1971.

Orwig, M. D. (ed.). Financing Higher Education: Alternatives for the Federal Government. Iowa City: American College Testing Program. Monograph Five. 1971.

Pacific Northwest Conference. Higher Education for an Expanding Population. Corvallis: Oregon State University, 1953.

Paltridge, James G. California's Coordinating Council for Higher Education. Berkeley: University of California Center for Research and Development in Higher Education, 1966.

Parker, Garland G. *The Enrollment Explosion.* New York: School & Society Books, 1971.

Parkyn, G. W. *Success and Failure at the University.* Wellington, New Zealand: New Zealand Council for Educational Research, Witcombe and Tombs, Ltd., 1967.

Peters, Bill Eugene. "A Comparison of 1966 and 1967 Freshman Students at Colorado State College, Admitted Under Two Sets of Admissions Standards." Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Stanford University, 1968.

Pipher, J. A. *Barriers to University.* Toronto: Ontario Institute for Studies in Education, 1962.

Prudential Insurance Company. *Facing Facts About College Admissions.* Newark, N.J.: Prudential Education Department, 1962.

Radcliffe, Shirley A. *Advanced Standing.* Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1961.

Ramsay, Shirley J. (ed.). *The ACAC Handbook for College Admissions, 1967-1970 Edition.* Evanston, Ill.: National Association of College Admissions Counselors, 1967.

Reuer, Phillip R. (ed.). *Open Admissions and Equal Access.* Monograph Four. Iowa City: The American College Testing Program, 1971.

Ridgeway, James. *The Closed Corporation: American Universities in Crisis.* New York: Random House, 1968.

Ribich, Thomas I. *Education and Poverty.* Washington, D.C.: The Brookings Institute, 1968.

Sanford, Nevitt. *The American College.* New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1952.

Shaffer, Robert H. and William D. Martinson. *Student Personnel Services in Higher Education.* New York: The Center for Applied Research in Education, Inc., 1966.

Smith, G. Kerry (ed.). *Current Issues in Higher Education.* Washington, D.C.: Association for Higher Education, 1966.

________. *Agony and Promise.* San Francisco: Jossey Bass, Inc., 1969.

________. *The Troubled Campus.* San Francisco: Jossey Bass, Inc., 1970.

Soldwedel, Bette J. *Preparing for College.* New York: The Macmillan Co., 1966.

Southern Regional Education Board. Changes in Admission Policies of Colleges and Universities in the South. Atlanta, Ga.: Southern Regional Education Board, 1962.

________. Summary of State Legislation Affecting Higher Education in the South. Atlanta: Southern Regional Education Board, 1966.

Spiva, Ulysses Van. "An Exploratory Analysis of the California State Board of Education and Its Policies Toward Racial Isolation in the Public Schools." Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation. Stanford University, 1971.

Staff and Students of Experiment in Higher Education. Higher Education for the Disadvantaged. A Commentary. East St. Louis, Ill.: Southern Illinois University at Edwardsville, 1968.

Stein, Morris I. Personality Measures in Admissions. New York: College Entrance Examination Board, 1963.

Stone, James C. California's Commitment to Public Education. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell, 1961.

Stucky, Milo O. and Kenneth E. Anderson. A Study of Persistence in College Attendance in Relation to Placement-Test Scores and Grade-Point Averages. Lawrence, Kansas: Kansas School of Education, 1959.

Sulkin, Sidney. Complete Planning for College. New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1967.

Sullivan, Neil V. Now is the Time. Bloomington, Indiana: Indiana University Press, 1969.

Tead, Ordway. Administration. New York: Harper, 1959.

Thornton, James W. Going to College in California. San Francisco: Fearon Publishing Co., 1965.

Thresher, B. Alden. College Admissions and the Public Interest. New York: College Entrance Examination Board, 1966.

Twenty-Fifth Annual Utah Conference on Higher Education. Salt Lake City, Utah. Dixie College, St. George, Utah, 1968.

Commission of Education and National Science Foundation Director. Educational Opportunity Bank. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1967.

U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare. Report on Higher Education. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office (The Newman Report), 1970.

U.S. Office of Education. *Opening Fall Enrollment in Higher Education, 1967.* Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1968.

United States Senate. *Hearing Before the Permanent Job Committee on Investigations of the Committee on Government Operations.* Vol. 56. Riots, Crime and Criminal Disorders, and Disruptions on College Campuses. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1969.

Utah Coordinating Council of Higher Education. *Utah's Master Plan for Higher Education.* Salt Lake City: The Council, 1968.

Wiggins, Sam P. *The Desegregation Era in Higher Education.* Berkeley: McCutchan Publishing Corp, 1966.

Wilson, Kenneth M. (ed.). *Research Related to College Admissions.* Atlanta: Southern Regional Education Board, 1965.

Willingham, Warren W. *Free Access to Higher Education.* New York: College Entrance Examination Board, 1970.

Wing, Cliff W., Jr. and Michael A. Wallach. *College Admissions and the Philosophy of Talent.* New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, Inc., 1971.

Wolk, Ronald A. *Alternative Methods of Federal Funding for Higher Education.* Berkeley: Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, 1968.

Woodson, Carter G. *The Miseducation of the Negro.* Washington, D.C.: The Associated Publishers, Inc., 1933.

Young, Kenneth E. "Who Can and Should Go to What Kind of College." Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation. Stanford University, 1953.

## Periodicals

Bonham, George W. (ed.). *Change.* New Rochelle, N.Y. Vol. 4, No. 2, March, 1972.

Chrisman, Robert (ed.). *The Black Scholar.* San Francisco: The Black World Foundation, Vol. 1, No. 2-3, Jan.-Feb., 1970.

Dobbins, Charles G. (ed.). *Educational Record.* Washington, D.C. Vol. 52, No. 1, Winter, 1971.

Elam, Stanley M. (ed.). *Phi Delta Kappan,* Bloomington, Ind.: Vol. 53, No. 4, December, 1971.

Elam, Stanley M. (ed.) Phi Delta Kappan. Vol. 53, No. 5, January, 1972.

Mahn, Robert E. (ed.). College and University. Washington, D.C.: American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers. Vol. 47, No. 1, Fall, 1971.

Newsweek. Report From Black America. New York: June 30, 1969.

Silverman, Robert J. (ed.). The Journal of Higher Education. Columbus: Ohio University Press. Vol. 41, No. 6, June, 1970.

________. ________. Vol. 41, No. 7, October, 1970.

________. ________. Vol. 41, No. 8, November, 1970.

________. ________. Vol. 41, No. 9, December, 1970.

________. ________. Vol. 42, No. 1, January, 1971.

________. ________. Vol. 43, No. 1, January, 1972.

Smith, Arthur L. (ed.). Journal of Black Studies. Los Angeles: Vol. 1, No. 3. Sage Publications: March, 1971.

Stan, Emily A. (ed.). College Student Personnel Abstracts. Claremont, CA.: Claremont Institute for Administrative Studies. Vol. 7, No. 1, Fall, 1971.

# APPENDICES

# APPENDIX I-A

## COPY OF FOCUSED INTERVIEW QUESTIONNAIRE ADMINISTERED TO ADMISSIONS OFFICERS, ASSOCIATE OR ASSISTANT ADMISSIONS OFFICERS, DIRECTORS OF EOP, AND DIRECTOR FOR FINANCIAL AIDS

DATA GATHERING INSTRUMENT NUMBER ONE FOCUSED INTERVIEW QUESTIONNAIRE PART 1.

Interviewee ______________________
Title of Position ________________ Institution ______________________ Interviewer ______________________
Date ______________________

QUESTION: What specific institutional General Admissions Policies were waived for the Special Admissions Programs?

| Code:<br>GAP=General Admissions Policy<br>SAP=Special Admissions Programs<br>GAS=General Admissions Students<br>SAS=Special Admissions Students | General Admissions Policy | | Special Admissions Programs | | Frequency of use, 1=often 2=some, 3=seldom | | Rank of importance in securing admission | | Lower limit test scores | | Lower limits GPA | | Rank in high school graduating class | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Yes | No | Yes | No | GAS | SAS | GAS | SAS | GAS | SAS | GAS | SAS | GAS | SAS |
| 1. Tests: Which of the following tests were required for admission to your school?<br>(1, 1966-1967<br>a. SAT (Scholastic Aptitude Test) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| b. GAT (General Achievement Test) | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| c. Other | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| (2) 1967-1968 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| a. SAT | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| b. GAT | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| c. Other | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| (3) 1968-1969 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| a. SAT | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| b. GAT | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| c. Other | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| (4) 1969-1970 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| a. SAT | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| b. GAT | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| c. Other | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| (5) 1970-1971 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| a. SAT | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| b. GAT | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| c. Other | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

DATA GATHERING INSTRUMENT NUMBER ONE FOCUSED INTERVIEW QUESTIONNAIRE PART 1.

| Code:<br>GAP=General Admissions Policy<br>SAP=Special Admissions Programs<br>GAS=General Admissions Students<br>SAS=Special Admissions Students | General Admissions Policy | | Special Admissions Programs | | Frequency of use, 1=often 2=some, 3=seldom | | Rank of importance in securing admission | | Lower limit test scores | | Lower limits GPA | | Rank in high school graduating class | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Yes | No | Yes | No | GAS | SAS | GAS | SAS | GAS | SAS | GAS | SAS | GAS | SAS |
| 2. Grades: Were grades and grade point averages (GPA) a determinant in gaining admission to your college? | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| (1) 1966-1967 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| (2) 1967-1968 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| (3) 1968-1969 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| (4) 1969-1970 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| (5) 1970-1971 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3. What were the lower GPA limits for students admitted to your college? | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| (1) 1966-1967 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| (2) 1967-1968 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| (3) 1968-1969 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| (4) 1969-1970 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| (5) 1970-1971 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4. Was rank in high school graduating class a determinant in gaining admission to your college? | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| (1) 1966-1967 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| (2) 1967-1968 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| (3) 1968-1969 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| (4) 1969-1970 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| (5) 1970-1971 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

DATA GATHERING INSTRUMENT NUMBER ONE FOCUSED INTERVIEW QUESTIONNAIRE PART 1.

| Code:<br>GAP=General Admissions Policy<br>SAP=Special Admissions Programs<br>GAS=General Admissions Students<br>SAS=Special Admissions Students | General Admissions Policy | | Special Admissions Programs | | Frequency of use, 1=often 2=some, 3=seldom | | Rank of importance in securing admission | | Lower limit test scores | | Lower limits GPA | | Rank in high school graduating class | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Yes | No | Yes | No | GAS | SAS | GAS | SAS | GAS | SAS | GAS | SAS | GAS | SAS |
| 5. What was the lower limit allowed for a student's rank in his high school graduating class to gain admission to your college? | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| (1) 1966-1967 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| (2) 1967-1968 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| (3) 1968-1969 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| (4) 1969-1970 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| (5) 1970-1971 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 6. Did your college admissions policies include proof of the student's financial stability? | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| (1) 1966-1967 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| (2) 1967-1968 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| (3) 1968-1969 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| (4) 1969-1970 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| (5) 1970-1971 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 7. How did your college secure proof of the student's financial stability? | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| (1) 1966-1967 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| (2) 1967-1968 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| (3) 1968-1969 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| (4) 1969-1970 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| (5) 1970-1971 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

DATA GATHERING INSTRUMENT NUMBER ONE FOCUSED INTERVIEW QUESTIONNAIRE PART 1.

| Code:<br>GAP=General Admissions Policy<br>SAP=Special Admissions Programs<br>GAS=General Admissions Students<br>SAS=Special Admissions Students | General Admissions Policy | | Special Admissions Programs | | Frequency of use, 1=often 2=some, 3=seldom | | Rank of importance in securing admission | | Lower limit test scores | | Lower limits GPA | | Rank in high school graduating class | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Yes | No | Yes | No | GAS | SAS | GAS | SAS | GAS | SAS | GAS | SAS | GAS | SAS |
| 8. Did your admissions policy require personal interviews for prospective students? | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| (1) 1966-1967 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| (2) 1967-1968 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| (3) 1968-1969 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| (4) 1969-1970 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| (5) 1970-1971 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 9. How many personal interviews did your college admissions policy require? | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| (1) 1966-1967 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| (2) 1967-1968 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| (3) 1968-1969 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| (4) 1969-1970 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| (5) 1970-1971 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 10. Did your admissions policy require a letter of reference? | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| (1) 1966-1967 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| (2) 1967-1968 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| (3) 1968-1969 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| (4) 1969-1970 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| (5) 1970-1971 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

DATA GATHERING INSTRUMENT NUMBER ONE FOCUSED INTERVIEW QUESTIONNAIRE PART 1.

| Code:<br>GAP=General Admissions Policy<br>SAP=Special Admissions Programs<br>GAS=General Admissions Students<br>SAS=Special Admissions Students | General Admissions Policy | | Special Admissions Programs | | Frequency of use, 1=often 2=some, 3=seldom | | Rank of importance in securing admission | | Lower limit test scores | | Lower limits GPA | | Rank in high school graduating class | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Yes | No | Yes | No | GAS | SAS | GAS | SAS | GAS | SAS | GAS | SAS | GAS | SAS |
| 11. How many letters of reference were required for admission to your college? | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| (1) 1966-1967 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| (2) 1967-1968 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| (3) 1968-1969 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| (4) 1969-1970 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| (5) 1970-1971 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 12. Did admissions policy require a letter of reference from student's former high school? | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| (1) 1966-1967 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| (2) 1967-1968 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| (3) 1968-1969 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| (4) 1969-1970 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| (5) 1970-1971 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 13. Did your admissions policy require at least one character reference? | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| (1) 1966-1967 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| (2) 1967-1968 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| (3) 1968-1969 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| (4) 1969-1970 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| (5) 1970-1971 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

DATA GATHERING INSTRUMENT NUMBER ONE FOCUSED INTERVIEW QUESTIONNAIRE PART 1.

| Code:<br>GAP=General Admissions Policy<br>SAP=Special Admissions Programs<br>GAS=General Admissions Students<br>SAS=Special Admissions Students | General Admissions Policy | | Special Admissions Programs | | Frequency of use, 1=often 2=some, 3=seldom | | Rank of importance in securing admission | | Lower limit test scores | | Lower limits GPA | | Rank in high school graduating class | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Yes | No | Yes | No | CAS | SAS | GAS | SAS | GAS | SAS | GAS | SAS | GAS | SAS |
| 14. Did your admissions policies require a character reference letter from one of the following? | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| (1) 1966-1967 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| a. teacher | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| b. religious leader | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| c. attorney | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| d. other | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| (2) 1967-1968 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| a. teacher | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| b. religious leader | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| c. attorney | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| d. other | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| (3) 1968-1969 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| a. teacher | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| b. religious leader | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| c. attorney | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| d. other | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| (4) 1969-1970 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| a. teacher | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| b. religious leader | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| c. attorney | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| d. other | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| (5) 1970-1971 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| a. teacher | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| b. religious leader | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| c. attorney | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| d. other | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

DATA GATHERING INSTRUMENT NUMBER ONE FOCUSED INTERVIEW QUESTIONNAIRE PART 1.

| Code:<br>GAP=General Admissions Policy<br>SAP=Special Admissions Programs<br>GAS=General Admissions Students<br>SAS=Special Admissions Students | General Admissions Policy | | Special Admissions Programs | | Frequency of use, 1=often 2=some, 3=seldom | | Rank of importance in securing admission | | Lower limit test scores | | Lower limits GPA | | Rank in high school graduating class | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Yes | No | Yes | No | GAS | SAS | GAS | SAS | GAS | SAS | GAS | SAS | GAS | SAS |
| 15. Did your college admissions policy require students have experience in high school extracurricular activities? | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| (1) 1966-1967 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| (2) 1967-1968 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| (3) 1968-1969 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| (4) 1969-1970 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| (5) 1970-1971 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 6. How many extracurricular activities did your admissions policy require each student to have experience in? | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| (1) 1966-1967 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| (2) 1967-1968 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| (3) 1968-1969 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| (4) 1969-1970 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| (5) 1970-1971 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 7. Did your college admissions require work experience as a determinant to gaining admission? | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| (1) 1966-1967 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| (2) 1967-1968 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| (3) 1968-1969 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| (4) 1969-1970 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| (5) 1970-1971 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

DATA GATHERING INSTRUMENT NUMBER ONE FOCUSED INTERVIEW QUESTIONNAIRE PART 1.

| Code:<br>GAP=General Admissions Policy<br>SAP=Special Admissions Programs<br>GAS=General Admissions Students<br>SAS=Special Admissions Students | General Admissions Policy |  | Special Admissions Programs |  | Frequency of use, 1=often 2=some, 3=selcom |  | Rank of importance in securing admission |  | Lower limit test scores |  | Lower limits GPA |  | Rank in high school graduating class |  |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
|  | Yes | No | Yes | No | GAS | SAS | GAS | SAS | GAS | SAS | GAS | SAS | GAS | SAS |
| 18. How much total work experience did your college admissions policy require for students prior to entering college?<br>(1) 1966-1967 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| (2) 1967-1968 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| (3) 1968-1969 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| (4) 1969-1970 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| (5) 1970-1971 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 19. Did your college admissions policy include additional determinants for admissions which we have not addressed during this interview?<br>(1) 1966-1967 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | / |  |
| (2) 1967-1968 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| (3) 1968-1969 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| (4) 1969-1970 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| (5) 1970-1971 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

DATA GATHERING INSTRUMENT NUMBER TWO

## FOCUSED INTERVIEW QUESTIONNAIRE PART 2.

Institution ________________

Interviewee ________________

Title of Position ________________

Date ________________

Interviewer ________________

QUESTION: What specific services (finances, tutoring, counseling, aid, et cetera) were offered students during the years between 1966-1967 and 1970-1971?

| | General Admissions Students | | Special Admissions Students | | Approx. Num. of students receiv. serv. | | Approx. % of students receiving service | | Approx. % Inc. or Decrease over previous year | | Approx. Total Finan. value of services rendered | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Yes | No | Yes | No | GAS | SAS | GAS | SAS | GAS | SAS | GAS | SAS |
| 1. Finance: Did your college pay or secure tuition grants for students? | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| (1) 1966-1967 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| (2) 1967-1968 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| (3) 1968-1969 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| (4) 1969-1970 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| (5) 1970-1971 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2. Books and Supplies: Did your college pay or provide students with financial aid for books and supplies? | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| (1) 1966-1967 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| (2) 1967-1968 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| (3) 1968-1969 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| (4) 1969-1970 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| (5) 1970-1971 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3. Housing Finance: Did your college provide students with financial aid for housing? | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| (1) 1966-1967 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| (2) 1967-1968 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| (3) 1968-1969 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| (4) 1969-1970 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| (5) 1970-1971 | | | | | | | | | | | | |

DATA GATHERING INSTRUMENT NUMBER TWO

## FOCUSED INTERVIEW QUESTIONNAIRE PART 2.

QUESTION: What specific services (finances, tutoring, counseling, aid, et cetera) were offered students during the years between 1966-1967 and 1970-1971?

| | General Admissions Students | | Special Admissions Students | | Approx. Num. of students receiving service | | Approx. % of students receiving service | | Approx. % Inc. or Decrease over previous year | | Approx. Total Finan. value of services rendered | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Yes | No | Yes | No | GAS | SAS | GAS | SAS | GAS | SAS | GAS | SAS |
| 4. Finance for meals: Did your college provide students with financial aid for meals?<br>(1) 1966-1967 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| (2) 1967-1968 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| (3) 1968-1969 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| (4) 1969-1970 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| (5) 1970-1971 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Cost of Living: Did your college provide students with financial aid for cost of living?<br>(1) 1966-1967 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| (2) 1967-1968 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| (3) 1968-1969 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| (4) 1969-1970 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| (5) 1970-1971 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Transportation finance: Did your college provide students with financial aid for transportation?<br>(1) 1966-1967 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| (2) 1967-1968 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| (3) 1968-1969 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| (4) 1969-1970 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| (5) 1970-1971 | | | | | | | | | | | | |

DATA GATHERING INSTRUMENT NUMBER TWO

FOCUSED INTERVIEW QUESTIONNAIRE PART 2.

QUESTION: What specific services (finances, tutoring, counseling, aid, et cetera) were offered students during the years between 1966-1967 and 1970-1971?

| | General Admissions Students | | Special Admissions Students | | Approx. Num. of students receiving service | | Approx. % of students receiving service | | Approx. % Incr. or Decrease over previous year | | Approx. Total Finan. value of services rendered | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Yes | No | Yes | No | GAS | SAS | GAS | SAS | GAS | SAS | GAS | SAS |
| 7. Tuition: Did your college require a tuition to be paid by students? | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| (1) 1966-1967 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| (2) 1967-1968 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| (3) 1968-1969 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| (4) 1969-1970 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| (5) 1970-1971 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 8. What was the approximate financial value of your yearly college tuition? | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| (1) 1966-1967 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| (2) 1967-1968 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| (3) 1968-1969 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| (4) 1969-1970 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| (5) 1970-1971 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 9. Additional Financial Aid: What additional financial services did your college provide for students? | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| (1) 1966-1967 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| a. | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| b. | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| c. | | | | | | | | | | | | |

DATA GATHERING INSTRUMENT NUMBER TWO FOCUSED INTERVIEW QUESTIONNAIRE PART 2.

QUESTION: What specific services (finances, tutoring, counseling, aid, et cetera) were offered students during the years between 1966-1967 and 1970-1971?

| | General Admissions Students | | Special Admissions Students | | Approx. Num. of students receiving service | | Approx % of students receiving service | | Approx % Incr. or Decrease over previous year | | Approx. Total Finan. value of services rendered | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Yes | No | Yes | No | GAS | SAS | GAS | SAS | GAS | SAS | GAS | SAS |
| 9. Additional Financial Services (Continued): | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| (2) 1967-1968 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| a. | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| b. | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| c. | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| (3) 1968-1969 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| a. | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| b. | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| c. | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| (4) 1969-1970 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| a. | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| b. | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| c. | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| (5) 1970-1971 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| a. | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| b. | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| c. | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 10. Tutorial Service: Did your college provide or secure tutorial service for students? | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| (1) 1966-1967 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| (2) 1967-1968 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| (3) 1968-1969 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| (4) 1969-1970 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| (5) 1970-1971 | | | | | | | | | | | | |

DATA GATHERING INSTRUMENT NUMBER TWO

## FOCUSED INTERVIEW QUESTIONNAIRE PART 2.

QUESTION: What specific services (finances, tutoring, counseling, aid, et cetera) were offered students during the years between 1966-1967 and 1970-1971?

| | General Admissions Students | | Special Admissions Students | | Approx. Num. of students receiving service | | Approx. % of students receiving service | | Approx. % Incr. or Decrease over previous year | | Approx. Total Finan. value of services rendered | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Yes | No | Yes | No | GAS | SAS | GAS | SAS | GAS | SAS | GAS | SAS |
| 11. What were the approximate number of hours students received in tutorial service? | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| (1) 1966-1967 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| (2) 1967-1968 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| (3) 1968-1969 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| (4) 1969-1970 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| (5) 1970-1971 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 12. Individual Counseling: Did your college provide counseling service for students? | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| (1) 1966-1967 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| (2) 1967-1968 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| (3) 1968-1969 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| (4) 1969-1970 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| (5) 1970-1971 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 13. Placement Service: Did your college provide job placement for students? | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| (1) 1966-1967 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| (2) 1967-1968 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| (3) 1968-1969 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| (4) 1969-1970 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| (5) 1970-1971 | | | | | | | | | | | | |

DATA GATHERING INSTRUMENT NUMBER TWO FOCUSED INTERVIEW QUESTIONNAIRE PART 2.

QUESTION: What specific services (finances, tutoring, counseling, aid, et cetera) were offered students during the years between 1966-1967 and 1970-1971?

| | General Admissions Students | | Special Admissions Students | | Approx. Num. of students receiving service | | Approx. % of students receiving service | | Approx. % Incr. or Decrease over previous year | | Approx. Total Finan. value of services rendered | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Yes | No | Yes | No | GAS | SAS | GAS | SAS | GAS | SAS | GAS | SAS |
| 14. Health Service: Which response best describes the health services your college offered students? | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| (1) 1966-1967 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| a. major medical | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| b. minor medical | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| c. other | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| (2) 1967-1968 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| a. major medical | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| b. minor medical | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| c. other | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| (3) 1968-1969 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| a. major medical | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| b. minor medical | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| c. other | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| (4) 1969-1970 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| a. major medical | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| b. minor medical | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| c. other | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| (5) 1970-1971 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| a. major medical | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| b. minor medical | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| c. other | | | | | | | | | | | | |

DATA GATHERING INSTRUMENT NUMBER TWO FOCUSED INTERVIEW QUESTIONNAIRE PART 2.

QUESTION: What specific services (finances, tutoring, counseling, aid, et cetera) were offered students during the years between 1966-1967 and 1970-1971?

| | General Admissions Students | | Special Admissions Students | | Approx. Num. of students receiving service | | Approx. % of students receiving service | | Approx. % Incr. or Decrease over previous year | | Approx. Total Finan. value of services rendered | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Yes | No | Yes | No | GAS | SAS | GAS | SAS | GAS | SAS | GAS | SAS |
| 15. Additional Services: What additional services did your college provide students which we have not addressed during this interview?<br>(1) 1966-1967 ______ | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| (2) 1967-1968 ______ | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| (3) 1968-1969 ______ | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| (4) 1969-1970 ______ | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| (5) 1970-1971 ______ | | | | | | | | | | | | |

DATA GATHERING INSTRUMENT NUMBER THREE

FOCUSED INTERVIEW QUESTIONNAIRE PART 3.

Interviewee ______________________

Title of Position ________________

Institution ____________________________

Date ______________________

Interviewer ______________

QUESTION: How, in the judgment of Admissions Officers, has the racial composition of the student populace changed as a result of Special Admissions Programs?

| Code:<br>a=White d=American Indian<br>b=Black e=Asian American<br>c=Mexican American f=other | Approx. Number of Students | | Approx. % of Student Populace | | Number Increase or Decrease over Previous Year | | Approx. % Increase or Decrease over Previous Year | | Goals or Proj. % of Student Populace | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | GAS | SAS | GAS | SAS | GAS | SAS | GAS | SAS | GAS | SAS |
| 1. What was the approximate racial and ethnic composition of your total student populace in 1966-1967? | | | | | | | | | | |
| (1) Freshmen | | | | | | | | | | |
| a. | | | | | | | | | | |
| b. | | | | | | | | | | |
| c. | | | | | | | | | | |
| d. | | | | | | | | | | |
| e. | | | | | | | | | | |
| f. | | | | | | | | | | |
| (2) Sophomores | | | | | | | | | | |
| a. | | | | | | | | | | |
| b. | | | | | | | | | | |
| c. | | | | | | | | | | |
| d. | | | | | | | | | | |
| e. | | | | | | | | | | |
| f. | | | | | | | | | | |
| (3) Juniors | | | | | | | | | | |
| a. | | | | | | | | | | |
| b. | | | | | | | | | | |
| c. | | | | | | | | | | |
| d. | | | | | | | | | | |
| e. | | | | | | | | | | |
| f. | | | | | | | | | | |

DATA GATHERING INSTRUMENT NUMBER THREE

FOCUSED INTERVIEW QUESTIONNAIRE PART 3.

| Code:<br>a=White d=American Indian<br>b=Black e=Asian American<br>c=Mexican American f=other | Approx. Number of Students | | Approx. % of Student Populace | | Number Increase or Decrease over Previous Year | | Approx. % Increase or Decrease over Previous Year | | Goals or Proj. % of Student Populace | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | GAS | SAS | GAS | SAS | GAS | SAS | GAS | SAS | GAS | SAS |
| 1. (Continued). Racial and ethnic composition for year 1966-1967 | | | | | | | | | | |
| (4) Seniors | | | | | | | | | | |
| a. | | | | | | | | | | |
| b. | | | | | | | | | | |
| c. | | | | | | | | | | |
| d. | | | | | | | | | | |
| e. | | | | | | | | | | |
| f. | | | | | | | | | | |
| (5) Graduates | | | | | | | | | | |
| a. | | | | | | | | | | |
| b. | | | | | | | | | | |
| c. | | | | | | | | | | |
| d. | | | | | | | | | | |
| e. | | | | | | | | | | |
| f. | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2. What was the approximate racial and ethnic composition of your total student populace for the academic year 1967-1968? | | | | | | | | | | |
| (1) Freshmen | | | | | | | | | | |
| a. | | | | | | | | | | |
| b. | | | | | | | | | | |
| c. | | | | | | | | | | |
| d. | | | | | | | | | | |
| e. | | | | | | | | | | |
| f. | | | | | | | | | | |

DATA GATHERING INSTRUMENT NUMBER THREE FOCUSED INTERVIEW QUESTIONNAIRE PART 3.

| Code:<br>a=White d=American Indian<br>b=Black e=Asian American<br>c=Mexican American f=other | Approx. Number of Students | | Approx. % of Student Populace | | Number Increase or Decrease over Previous Year | | Approx. % Increase or Decrease over Previous Year | | Goals or Proj. % of Student Populace | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | GAS | SAS | GAS | SAS | GAS | SAS | GAS | SAS | GAS | SAS |
| 2. (Continued) Racial and ethnic composition for year 1967-1968 | | | | | | | | | | |
| (2) Sophomores | | | | | | | | | | |
| a. | | | | | | | | | | |
| b. | | | | | | | | | | |
| c. | | | | | | | | | | |
| d. | | | | | | | | | | |
| e. | | | | | | | | | | |
| f. | | | | | | | | | | |
| (3) Juniors | | | | | | | | | | |
| a. | | | | | | | | | | |
| b. | | | | | | | | | | |
| c. | | | | | | | | | | |
| d. | | | | | | | | | | |
| e. | | | | | | | | | | |
| f. | | | | | | | | | | |
| (4) Seniors | | | | | | | | | | |
| a. | | | | | | | | | | |
| b. | | | | | | | | | | |
| c. | | | | | | | | | | |
| d. | | | | | | | | | | |
| e. | | | | | | | | | | |
| f. | | | | | | | | | | |
| (5) Graduates | | | | | | | | | | |
| a. | | | | | | | | | | |
| b. | | | | | | | | | | |
| c. | | | | | | | | | | |
| d. | | | | | | | | | | |
| e. | | | | | | | | | | |
| f. | | | | | | | | | | |

DATA GATHERING INSTRUMENT NUMBER THREE

FOCUSED INTERVIEW QUESTIONNAIRE PART 3.

| Code:<br>a=White<br>b=Black<br>c=Mexican American<br>d=American Indian<br>e=Asian American<br>f=other | Approx. Number of Students | | Approx. % of Student Populace | | Number Increase or Decrease over Previous Year | | Approx. % Increase or Decrease over Previous Year | | Goals or Proj. % of Student Populace | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | GAS | SAS | GAS | SAS | GAS | SAS | GAS | SAS | GAS | SAS |
| 3. What was the approximate racial and ethnic composition of your total student populace for the academic year 1968-1969? | | | | | | | | | | |
| (1) Freshmen | | | | | | | | | | |
| a. | | | | | | | | | | |
| b. | | | | | | | | | | |
| c. | | | | | | | | | | |
| d. | | | | | | | | | | |
| e. | | | | | | | | | | |
| f. | | | | | | | | | | |
| (2) Sophomores | | | | | | | | | | |
| a. | | | | | | | | | | |
| b. | | | | | | | | | | |
| c. | | | | | | | | | | |
| d. | | | | | | | | | | |
| e. | | | | | | | | | | |
| f. | | | | | | | | | | |
| (3) Juniors | | | | | | | | | | |
| a. | | | | | | | | | | |
| b. | | | | | | | | | | |
| c. | | | | | | | | | | |
| d. | | | | | | | | | | |
| e. | | | | | | | | | | |
| f. | | | | | | | | | | |

DATA GATHERING INSTRUMENT NUMBER THREE FOCUSED INTERVIEW QUESTIONNAIRE PART 3.

| Code:<br>a=White d=American Indian<br>b=Black e=Asian American<br>c=Mexican American f=other | Approx. Number of Students | | Approx. % of Student Populace | | Number Increase or Decrease over Previous Year | | Approx. % Increase or Decrease over Previous Year | | Goals or Proj. % of Student Populace | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | GAS | SAS | GAS | SAS | GAS | SAS | GAS | SAS | GAS | SAS |
| 3. (Continued) Racial and ethnic composition for year 1968-1969 | | | | | | | | | | |
| (4) Seniors | | | | | | | | | | |
| a. | | | | | | | | | | |
| b. | | | | | | | | | | |
| c. | | | | | | | | | | |
| d. | | | | | | | | | | |
| e. | | | | | | | | | | |
| f. | | | | | | | | | | |
| (5) Graduates | | | | | | | | | | |
| a. | | | | | | | | | | |
| b. | | | | | | | | | | |
| c. | | | | | | | | | | |
| d. | | | | | | | | | | |
| e. | | | | | | | | | | |
| f. | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4. What was the approximate racial and ethnic composition of your total student population for the academic year 1969-1970? | | | | | | | | | | |
| (1) Freshmen | | | | | | | | | | |
| a. | | | | | | | | | | |
| b. | | | | | | | | | | |
| c. | | | | | | | | | | |
| d. | | | | | | | | | | |
| e. | | | | | | | | | | |
| f. | | | | | | | | | | |

DATA GATHERING INSTRUMENT NUMBER THREE

FOCUSED INTERVIEW QUESTIONNAIRE PART 3.

| Code:<br>a=White d=American Indian<br>b=Black e=Asian American<br>c=Mexican American f=other | Approx. Number of Students | | Approx. % of Student Populace | | Number Increase or Decrease over Previous Year | | Approx. % Increase or Decrease over Previous Year | | Goals or Proj. % of Student Populace | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | GAS | SAS | GAS | SAS | GAS | SAS | GAS | SAS | GAS | SAS |
| 4. (Continued) Racial and ethnic composition for year 1969-1970<br>(2) Sophomores<br>a. | | | | | | | | | | |
| b. | | | | | | | | | | |
| c. | | | | | | | | | | |
| d. | | | | | | | | | | |
| e. | | | | | | | | | | |
| f. | | | | | | | | | | |
| (3) Juniors<br>a. | | | | | | | | | | |
| b. | | | | | | | | | | |
| c. | | | | | | | | | | |
| d. | | | | | | | | | | |
| e. | | | | | | | | | | |
| f. | | | | | | | | | | |
| (4) Seniors<br>a. | | | | | | | | | | |
| b. | | | | | | | | | | |
| c. | | | | | | | | | | |
| d. | | | | | | | | | | |
| e. | | | | | | | | | | |
| f. | | | | | | | | | | |
| (5) Graduates<br>a. | | | | | | | | | | |
| b. | | | | | | | | | | |
| c. | | | | | | | | | | |
| d. | | | | | | | | | | |
| e. | | | | | | | | | | |
| f. | | | | | | | | | | |

DATA GATHERING INSTRUMENT NUMBER THREE

FOCUSED INTERVIEW QUESTIONNAIRE PART 3.

| Code:<br>a=White d=American Indian<br>b=Black e=Asian American<br>c=Mexican American f=other | Approx. Number of Students |  | Approx. % of Student Populace |  | Number Increase or Decrease over Previous Year |  | Approx. % Increase or Decrease over Previous Year |  | Goals or Proj. % of Student Populace |  |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
|  | GAS | SAS | GAS | SAS | GAS | SAS | GAS | SAS | GAS | SAS |
| 5. What was the approximate racial and ethnic composition of your total student populace for the academic year 1970-1971? |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| (1) Freshmen |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| a. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| b. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| c. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| d. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| e. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| f. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| (2) Sophomores |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| a. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| b. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| c. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| d. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| e. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| f. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| (3) Juniors |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| a. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| b. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| c. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| d. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| e. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| f. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

DATA GATHERING INSTRUMENT NUMBER THREE FOCUSED INTERVIEW QUESTIONNAIRE PART 3.

| Code:<br>a=White d=American Indian<br>b=Black e=Asian American<br>c=Mexican American f=other | Approx. Number of Students |  | Approx. % of Student Populace |  | Number Increase or Decrease over Previous Year |  | Approx. % Increase or Decrease over Previous Year |  | Goals or Proj. % of Student Populace |  |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
|  | GAS | SAS | GAS | SAS | GAS | SAS | GAS | SAS | GAS | SAS |
| 5. (Continued) Racial and ethnic composition for the year 1970-1971 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| (4) Seniors |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| a. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| b. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| c. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| d. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| e. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| f. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| (5) Graduates |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| a. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| b. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| c. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| d. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| e. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| f. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 6. Graduates: What was the approximate racial and ethnic composition of all graduates from your institution for the academic year 1966-1967? |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| (1) All normal Four Year Degrees |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| a. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| b. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| c. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| d. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| e. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| f. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

DATA GATHERING INSTRUMENT NUMBER THREE FOCUSED INTERVIEW QUESTIONNAIRE PART 3.

| Code:<br>a=White d=American Indian<br>b=Black e=Asian American<br>c=Mexican American f=other | Approx. Number of Students | | Approx. % of Student Populace | | Number Increase or Decrease over Previous Year | | Approx. % Increase or Decrease over Previous Year | | Goals or Proj. % of Student Populace | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | GAS | SAS | GAS | SAS | GAS | SAS | GAS | SAS | GAS | SAS |
| 6. (Continued) Racial and ethnic composition of all graduates for the year 1966-67<br>(2) All Graduate Degrees | | | | | | | | | | |
| a. ______ | | | | | | | | | | |
| b. ______ | | | | | | | | | | |
| c. ______ | | | | | | | | | | |
| d. ______ | | | | | | | | | | |
| e. ______ | | | | | | | | | | |
| f. ______ | | | | | | | | | | |
| 7. What was the approximate racial and ethnic composition of all graduates for the year 1967-1968?<br>(1) All Four Year Degrees | | | | | | | | | | |
| a. ______ | | | | | | | | | | |
| b. ______ | | | | | | | | | | |
| c. ______ | | | | | | | | | | |
| d. ______ | | | | | | | | | | |
| e. ______ | | | | | | | | | | |
| f. ______ | | | | | | | | | | |
| (2) All Graduate Degrees | | | | | | | | | | |
| a. ______ | | | | | | | | | | |
| b. ______ | | | | | | | | | | |
| c. ______ | | | | | | | | | | |
| d. ______ | | | | | | | | | | |
| e. ______ | | | | | | | | | | |
| f. ______ | | | | | | | | | | |

DATA GATHERING INSTRUMENT NUMBER THREE

FOCUSED INTERVIEW QUESTIONNAIRE PART 3.

| Code:<br>a=White d=American Indian<br>b=Black e=Asian American<br>c=Mexican American f=other | Approx. Number of Students | | Approx. % of Student Populace | | Number Increase or Decrease over Previous Year | | Approx. % Increase or Decrease over Previous Year | | Goals or Proj. % of Student Populace | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | GAS | SAS | GAS | SAS | GAS | SAS | GAS | SAS | GAS | SAS |
| 8. What was the approximate racial and ethnic composition of all graduates for the year 1968-1969? | | | | | | | | | | |
| (1) All Four Year Degrees | | | | | | | | | | |
| a. | | | | | | | | | | |
| b. | | | | | | | | | | |
| c. | | | | | | | | | | |
| d. | | | | | | | | | | |
| e. | | | | | | | | | | |
| f. | | | | | | | | | | |
| (2) All Graduate Degrees | | | | | | | | | | |
| a. | | | | | | | | | | |
| b. | | | | | | | | | | |
| c. | | | | | | | | | | |
| d. | | | | | | | | | | |
| e. | | | | | | | | | | |
| f. | | | | | | | | | | |
| 9. What was the approximate racial and ethnic composition of all graduates for the year 1969-1970? | | | | | | | | | | |
| (1) All Four Year Degrees | | | | | | | | | | |
| a. | | | | | | | | | | |
| b. | | | | | | | | | | |
| c. | | | | | | | | | | |
| d. | | | | | | | | | | |
| e. | | | | | | | | | | |
| f. | | | | | | | | | | |

DATA GATHERING INSTRUMENT NUMBER THREE

FOCUSED INTERVIEW QUESTIONNAIRE PART 3.

| Code:<br>a=White d=American Indian<br>b=Black e=Asian American<br>c=Mexican American f=other | Approx. Number of Students | | Approx. % of Student Populace | | Number Increase or Decrease over Previous Year | | Approx. % Increase or Decrease over Previous Year | | Goals or Proj. % of Student Populace | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | GAS | SAS | GAS | SAS | GAS | SAS | GAS | SAS | GAS | SAS |
| 9. (Continued) Racial and ethnic composition of all graduates for the year 1969-1970<br>(2) All Graduate Degrees | | | | | | | | | | |
| a. | | | | | | | | | | |
| b. | | | | | | | | | | |
| c. | | | | | | | | | | |
| d. | | | | | | | | | | |
| e. | | | | | | | | | | |
| f. | | | | | | | | | | |
| 10. What was the approximate racial and ethnic composition of all graduates for the academic year 1970-1971?<br>(1) All Four Year Degrees | | | | | | | | | | |
| a. | | | | | | | | | | |
| b. | | | | | | | | | | |
| c. | | | | | | | | | | |
| d. | | | | | | | | | | |
| e. | | | | | | | | | | |
| f. | | | | | | | | | | |
| (2) All Graduate Degrees | | | | | | | | | | |
| a. | | | | | | | | | | |
| b. | | | | | | | | | | |
| c. | | | | | | | | | | |
| d. | | | | | | | | | | |
| e. | | | | | | | | | | |
| f. | | | | | | | | | | |

DATA GATHERING INSTRUMENT NUMBER THREE - FOCUSED INTERVIEW QUESTIONNAIRE PART 3.

11. What three major determinants prevented your college from reflecting a more equitable racial and ethnic composition in your total student populace relative to the approximate racial and ethnic population of the surrounding communities?
    (1) 1966-1967
        a.
        b.
        c.
    (2) 1967-1968
        a.
        b.
        c.
    (3) 1968-1969
        a.
        b.
        c.
    (4) 1969-1970
        a.
        b.
        c.
    (5) 1970-1971
        a.
        b.
        c.

12. What are the three most important steps your college could have taken to make the racial and ethnic characteristics of your total student populace reflect more approximately the ethnic population of the surrounding communities?
    (1) 1966-1967
        a.
        b.
        c.
    (2) 1967-1968
        a.
        b.
        c.
    (3) 1968-1969
        a.
        b.
        c.
    (4) 1969-1970
        a.
        b.
        c.
    (5) 1970-1971
        a.
        b.
        c.

DATA GATHERING INSTRUMENT NUMBER THREE - FOCUSED INTERVIEW QUESTIONNAIRE PART 3.

13. The master plan for Higher Education in California stated in 1960 that public education in institutions of higher learning including the university system, the state college system, and junior colleges serve primarily their local and regional areas. Do you agree with this statement?

| | Yes | No |
|---|---|---|
| (1) 1966-1967 | | |
| (2) 1967-1968 | | |
| (3) 1968-1969 | | |
| (4) 1969-1970 | | |
| (5) 1970-1971 | | |

DATA GATHERING INSTRUMENT NUMBER FOUR - FOCUSED INTERVIEW QUESTIONNAIRE PART 4.

Institution ____________________ Date ____________________

Interviewee ____________________ Interviewer ____________________

Title of Position ____________________

QUESTION: Using a scale of one to six, how do Admissions Officers perceive the average performance for Special Admissions Students relative to the average performance for General Admissions Students from similar socio-economic backgrounds who did not receive special services, with respect to the following areas of progress?

| Q: Which response best describes your knowledge of student progress after admission? 1=none, 2= very little, 3=some, 4=much, 5=very much | Decidedly lower 1 | Somewhat lower 2 | About the same 3 | Somewhat higher 4 | Decidedly higher 5 | No opinion 6 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. Grades earned | | | | | | |
| a. 1966-1967 | | | | | | |
| b. 1967-1968 | | | | | | |
| c. 1968-1969 | | | | | | |
| d. 1969-1970 | | | | | | |
| e. 1970-1971 | | | | | | |
| 2. Progress toward degree requirements | | | | | | |
| a. 1966-1967 | | | | | | |
| b. 1967-1968 | | | | | | |
| c. 1968-1969 | | | | | | |
| d. 1969-1970 | | | | | | |
| e. 1970-1971 | | | | | | |
| 3. Social Adjustment | | | | | | |
| a. 1966-1967 | | | | | | |
| b. 1967-1968 | | | | | | |
| c. 1968-1969 | | | | | | |
| d. 1969-1970 | | | | | | |
| e. 1970-1971 | | | | | | |
| 4. Adjustment to academic rigors | | | | | | |
| a. 1966-1967 | | | | | | |
| b. 1967-1968 | | | | | | |
| c. 1968-1969 | | | | | | |
| d. 1969-1970 | | | | | | |
| e. 1970-1971 | | | | | | |
| 5. Drop-out rate | | | | | | |
| a. 1966-1967 | | | | | | |
| b. 1967-1968 | | | | | | |
| c. 1968-1969 | | | | | | |
| d. 1969-1970 | | | | | | |
| e. 1970-1971 | | | | | | |

DATA GATHERING INSTRUMENT NUMBER FOUR (Continued)

| Q: Which response best describes your knowledge of student progress after admission? 1=none, 2=very little, 3=some, 4=much, 5=very much | Decidedly lower<br>1 | Somewhat lower<br>2 | About the same<br>3 | Somewhat higher<br>4 | Decidedly higher<br>5 | No opinion<br>6 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 6. Time taken to earn degree | | | | | | |
| a. 1966-1967 | | | | | | |
| b. 1967-1968 | | | | | | |
| c. 1968-1969 | | | | | | |
| d. 1969-1970 | | | | | | |
| e. 1970-1971 | | | | | | |

DATA GATHERING INSTRUMENT NUMBER FIVE - FOCUSED INTERVIEW QUESTIONNAIRE PART 5.

Institution ______________________ Date ______________________

Interviewee ______________________ Interviewer ______________________

Title of Position ______________________

QUESTION: Using a scale of one to six, how do Admissions Officers perceive the average performance for Special Admissions students relative to the average performance for General Admissions students, with respect to the following areas of progress?

| Q: Which response best describes your knowledge of student progress after admission? 1=none, 2=very little, 3=some, 4=much, 5=very much | Decidedly lower 1 | Somewhat lower 2 | About the same 3 | Somewhat higher 4 | Decidedly higher 5 | No opinion 6 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. Grades earned | | | | | | |
| a. 1966-1967 | | | | | | |
| b. 1967-1968 | | | | | | |
| c. 1968-1969 | | | | | | |
| d. 1969-1970 | | | | | | |
| e. 1970-1971 | | | | | | |
| 2. Progress toward degree requirements | | | | | | |
| a. 1966-1967 | | | | | | |
| b. 1967-1968 | | | | | | |
| c. 1968-1969 | | | | | | |
| d. 1969-1970 | | | | | | |
| e. 1970-1971 | | | | | | |
| 3. Social adjustment | | | | | | |
| a. 1966-1967 | | | | | | |
| b. 1967-1968 | | | | | | |
| c. 1968-1969 | | | | | | |
| d. 1969-1970 | | | | | | |
| e. 1970-1971 | | | | | | |
| 4. Adjustment to academic rigors | | | | | | |
| a. 1966-1967 | | | | | | |
| b. 1967-1968 | | | | | | |
| c. 1968-1969 | | | | | | |
| d. 1969-1970 | | | | | | |
| e. 1970-1971 | | | | | | |
| 5. Drop-out rate | | | | | | |
| a. 1966-1967 | | | | | | |
| b. 1967-1968 | | | | | | |
| c. 1968-1969 | | | | | | |
| d. 1969-1970 | | | | | | |
| e. 1970-1971 | | | | | | |
| 6. Time taken to earn degree | | | | | | |
| a. 1966-1967 | | | | | | |
| b. 1967-1968 | | | | | | |
| c. 1968-1969 | | | | | | |
| d. 1969-1970 | | | | | | |
| e. 1970-1971 | | | | | | |

DATA GATHERING INSTRUMENT NUMBER SIX - FOCUSED INTERVIEW QUESTIONNAIRE PART 6.

Institution ____________________ Date ____________________

Interviewee ____________________ Interviewer ____________________

Title of Position ______________

QUESTION: What specific policy and operational changes of the Special Admissions Programs have been incorporated into the General Admissions Policies for the years 1966-1971?

In the column at the right, check whether the policy or operational change was a permanent part of the General Admissions Policies and Procedures as of June, 1971.

| Year | Policy or Operational Change | Policy | | Operational Procedures | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Yes | No | Yes | No |
| 1966-1967 | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| 1967-1968 | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| 1968-1969 | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| 1969-1970 | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| 1970-1971 | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |

## APPENDIX I-B

October 1, 1971

TO: ADMISSIONS OFFICERS

FROM: Howard Alford, Stanford University

RE: RESEARCH IN THE ADMINISTRATION OF HIGHER EDUCATION

"The Impact of Special Admissions Programs on General Admissions Policies in Institutions of Higher Learning"

Your institution can contribute to this research by providing the following information:

1. Reports on your Special Admissions Programs (description, progress, and evaluations) for the academic years 1966 through 1970-1971.

2. Reports on your total enrollment of students for the years 1966-1967 through 1970-1971, with a breakdown according to class (freshmen, sophomore, junior, and seniors) and ethnic groups (Black, White, Brown, Asian American and American Indian).

3. Reports on student dropout rates including numbers and percentages for the academic years 1966-1967 through 1970-1971, for General Admissions Students and Special Admissions Students.

4. Report on the number of graduates from your institution for the years 1966-1967 through 1970-1971 including a breakdown by ethnic groups listed above.

5. Reports on grades earned and number of courses (credits) taken by General Admissions Students and Special Admissions Students for the academic years listed above.

6. Reports on financial aid and other assistance given or provided for students including tutorial, individual counseling, etc., for the five (5) years stated above for General Admissions Students and Special Admissions Students.

7. Reports made by administrators (Admissions Officers, EOP Directors, and Financial Aid Officers) relative to opinions about Special Admissions and General Admissions Policies, procedures and practices for the five year period.

APPENDIX I-B (Continued)

8. Profiles of entering freshmen students to your college the Fall of 1961 through 1971.

Thank you.

cc: Mr. William Sherrill, University of California, Berkeley
Mr. Charles Stone, San Francisco State College, San Francisco
Mr. Roy Delpier, San Jose State College, San Jose
Mr. Patrick O'Donnell, Hayward State College, Hayward
Mr. Harold Soeters, Sonoma State College, Rohnert Park

# APPENDIX I-C

## COPY OF LETTER SENT TO TWENTY-TWO EDUCATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS INVOLVED IN SERVICE TO HIGHER EDUCATION IN AMERICA

Howard L. Alford
1335 Canton Drive
Milpitas, CA 95035
September 15, 1971

Dear Sirs:

Re: College Admissions

I am a graduate student at Stanford University, Stanford, CA, and involved in research of Higher Education. Would you send me any free materials and materials for sale including books, articles, shorts, or other and cost materials not to exceed $20.00 about College Admissions. I am particularly interested in the following:

1. Issues and determinants in developing, implementing and executing COLLEGE ADMISSIONS POLICY.
2. Various types of student aid programs including financial, tutorial, counseling, work-study and other special efforts made by colleges to aid students, ALL STUDENTS.
3. Special admissions programs . . . Any materials about what colleges have done across the nation in order to admit more minority students and poor students to the academic programs in Higher Education, and the results of this effort.
4. How students are financing their college education during the last two decades (50's and 60's).
5. What scholars and REPORTS say about who should go to what college and why.
6. The latest in what admissions policies are and what they ought to be in the several colleges across the nation.
7. The cost and accessibility of higher education over the last two decades. Including private and public cost.
8. Federal, state and local financial efforts in higher education for the past two decades.
9. Reports, etc. relative to the performance of poorer, Black or "Special Students" once admitted to the college curriculum. This includes what college administrators say and think, together with documented evidence of performances of Special students.

APPENDIX I-C (Continued)

10. Any additional materials which your organization feels would contribute directly to a study of the impact of "Special Admissions Programs on General Admissions Policies" in institutions of higher learning in America.

I am particularly interested in specific articles, books, reports, pamphlets and other shorts which directly relate to this study.

Kindly bill me at the above address for any cost materials up to $20.00.

Thank you.

Very truly yours,

/s/ Howard L. Alford

## APPENDIX I-D

## COPY OF LETTER SENT TO DEPARTMENTS OF EDUCATION IN THE FIFTY STATES

Howard L. Alford
1335 Canton Drive
Milpitas, CA 95035
September 20, 1971

Dear Sirs:

Re: Master Plans for Higher Education and
Special Admissions Programs

In an effort to make current developments available to institutions of higher learning in America, I am involved in researching the two areas listed above at Stanford University, Stanford, California.

Your office can assist greatly in this research by providing me with the following information about institutions of higher learning in your state:

1. A copy of your state's MASTER PLAN FOR HIGHER EDUCATION, or a short report indicating its purpose, scope, duration, cost, degree of effectiveness and other major features; and

2. A 1971 report of SPECIAL ADMISSIONS PROGRAMS currently in operation at your state's public and private institutions of Higher Learning.

    2.1 This could be done with a simple report showing the purpose, scope, date initiated, number of students admitted, special services offered for these students, drop out rate, cost, and basic projections.

    2.2 I would appreciate a short statement about the effectiveness and desirability of these SPECIAL ADMISSIONS PROGRAMS as seen by the administration of the various colleges and universities.

It pleases me to both include your state's contribution to this research, and to make the findings available should you be interested.

Thank you.

Very truly yours,

/s/ Howard L. Alford

# APPENDIX II

## STATE AGENCIES AUTHORIZED TO NOMINATE EOP CANDIDATES

California school districts having jurisdiction over one or more high schools, community colleges, or both high schools and community colleges

The California Community College Board of Governors

Coordinating Council for Higher Education

State Department of Corrections

State Department of Human Resources Development

State Department of Education

State Department of Employment

State Human Relations Agency

State Advisory Commission on Indian Affairs

Division of Apprenticeship Standards of the State Department of Industrial Relations

Division of Fair Employment Practices of the State Department of Industrial Relations

State Department of Parks & Recreation

State Department of Professional and Vocational Standards

California Board of Nursing Education and Nurse Registration

State Department of Rehabilitation

State Scholarship and Loan Commission

State Department of Social Welfare

State Department of Veterans' Affairs

State Department of Youth Authority

Robert O. Bess, ANNUAL REPORT ON EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITY PROGRAMS, 1970, Los Angeles, California, The California State Colleges, Office of the Chancellor (prepared for the Joint Legislative Budget Committee, An Unpublished Document), November, 1970.

## APPENDIX III-A

## TITLE 5 PROVISIONS FOR "SPECIAL" ADMISSIONS IN CALIFORNIA PUBLIC INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION

40759. Exceptions. (a) An applicant who is not otherwise eligible under the provisions of this article, may be admitted to a state college as a first-time freshman; provided, that the number of persons admitted pursuant to this subdivision for any academic year shall not exceed two percent of all persons anticipated to be admitted as first-time freshmen for the particular academic year. The Chancellor may institute such procedures as may be appropriate for the administration of this subdivision.

(b) An applicant who is not otherwise eligible under the provisions of this article may be admitted to a state college as a first-time freshman; provided, that he is a disadvantaged student for whom special compensatory assistance is available. and provided further, that the number of persons admitted pursuant to this subdivision for any academic year shall not exceed two percent of all persons anticipated to be admitted as first-time freshmen for the particular academic year. The provisions of this exception shall be implemented pursuant to guidelines established by the Chancellor in accordance with the policies of the Board of Trustees of the California State Colleges.

As used in Subchapter 2 of Chapter 5 of these regulations, the term "disadvantaged student" means a student who comes from a low income family, has the potential to perform satisfactorily on the college level, but who has been and appears to be unable to realize that potential without special assistance because of his economic, cultural or educational background or environment.

40806. Other Applicants. An applicant who does not meet the requirements of Sections 40803, 40804, and 40805, but who is eligible for admission as a first-time freshman on the basis of the admission requirements in effect at the time of his application for admission as an undergraduate transfer, other than the provisions of Section 40759, or who has completed sixty units of college credit, may be admitted to a state college as an undergraduate transfer, if in the judgment of the appropriate college authority, he can succeed at the state college.

40807. Exceptions. An applicant who is not eligible for admission as a first-time freshman on the basis of the admission requirements in effect at the time of his application for admission as an undergraduate transfer, other than the provisions of Section 40759, who has not completed sixty units of college credit, and who is not otherwise eligible under the provisions of this article, may be admitted to a state college as an undergraduate transfer; provided, that the number of applicants who are admitted pursuant to this subdivision for any academic year shall not exceed two percent of all applicants for admission as undergraduate transfer students for the particular academic year. The Chancellor may institute such procedures as may be appropriate for the administration of this section.

(b) An applicant who is not otherwise eligible under the provisions of this article, may be admitted to a state college as an undergraduate transfer; provided, that he is a disadvantaged student for whom special compensatory assistance is available; and provided further, that the number of persons admitted pursuant to this subdivision for any academic year shall not exceed two percent of all applicants for admission as undergraduate transfer students for the particular academic year.

The provisions of this exception shall be implemented pursuant to guidelines of the Chancellor established in accordance with the policies of the Board of Trustees of the California State Colleges.

(Title 5 Sections 40759, 40806, or 40807) or meets regular admission requirements but in the opinion of the college is only "technically" eligible and will require full assistance in order to succeed; (4) He is an undergraduate student.

Note: Failure to qualify under this definition does not preclude a student from receiving tutorial, counseling, and related assistance if the college wishes to provide it as an overload or through non-state funding. However, such individuals may not receive state EOP grants and they are not to be reported as EOP enrollees in any submissions for budgetary or evaluation purposes. In short, the intent of this definition is to provide a consistent base for counting and reporting, it is not intended to prohibit helping students who are enrolled at the college and subsequently encounter difficulties which EOP assistance might overcome. It is expected that the number of regularly eligible students enrolled in EOP will represent a relatively small proportion of the total, so long as available resources fall short of need.

3. Enrollment in the state funded program is to be limited to those who are essentially full-time students. This does not mean that they must enroll for a specific minimum number of units each term nor that they must maintain such a minimum load throughout each term. Rather it means that there exists in each case a "full-time" commitment to educational pursuits and that credit enrollment below the normal 12-unit minimum for definition as "full-time" is the result of a professional judgment that such an adjustment is appropriate. Eligibility to receive a state EOP grant is, of course, subject to maintaining the same level of credit enrollment as is required of all students receiving financial aid.

C. Program Administration

1. Expenditures of budgeted EOP funds for program purposes are to be limited to those activities designed to strengthen the performance capabilities of EOP students in particular. Activities such as orientation, special counseling, and advising, tutoring, supervised study, and extraordinary activities associated with recruitment and selection represent areas for which expenditures are appropriate. Courses given for regular academic credit, human relations activities and services generally available to all students may not be funded from your EOP allocation.

2. In addition to those kinds of records which are normally maintained in connection with all college activities, each college must also maintain the following:

   a. A current roster of bona fide EOP students enrolled in the state funded program, including term of first enrollment and basis of admission.

   b. A record for each EOP student including information on the nature and extent of formal services provided. Such a record should be designed to serve program needs, but should include, as a minimum, date seen, purpose (counseling, tutoring, advising, group sessions, etc.) and by whom seen.

   c. A current roster of EOP students receiving state EOP grants, including amount and period of grant.

(November, 1970)

## APPENDIX III-B

### THE CALIFORNIA STATE COLLEGES USE OF THE 2% RULE FOR LOWER DIVISION TRANSFERS, FALL, 1966, FALL, 1967

| College | Total UG Transfers | 1967 Except. Adm. | Except. Enrolled # | Except. Enrolled % | Total UG Trans. Aps. | 1968 Except. Adm. | Except. Enrolled # | Except. Enrolled % |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Dominguez Hills | 132 | 2 | 2 | 1.5 | 323 | 5(2) | 4 | 1.2 |
| Fullerton | 2242 | 6 | 3 | .1 | 2823 | -0- | -0- | -0- |
| Hayward | 2011 | 65(28) | 46 | 2.3 | 2471 | 57(31) | 54 | 2.2 |
| Long Beach | 4716 | 17 | 17 | .3 | 6939 | 27 | 23 | .3 |
| Los Angeles | 5003 | 58 | 53 | 1.1 | 5718 | 41(3) | 35 | .6 |
| San Bernardino | 475 | -0- | -0- | -0- | 554 | -0- | -0- | -0- |
| Cal Poly KV | 1604 | 28(5) | 20 | 1.2 | 1889 | 20(2) | 15 | .8 |
| Cal Poly SLO | 1832 | 22 | 14 | .8 | 2158 | 33 | 22 | 1.0 |
| Chico | 2048 | 35 | 32 | 1.6 | 2654 | 48 | 36 | 1.4 |
| Fresno | 2582 | 25 | 22 | .9 | 2845 | 28 | 24 | .8 |

## APPENDIX III-B (Continued)

| College | Total UG Transfers | 1967 Except. Adm. | Except. Enrolled # | Except. Enrolled % | Total UG Trans. Aps. | 1968 Except. Adm. | Except. Enrolled # | Except. Enrolled % |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Humboldt | 1003 | 19 | 16 | 1.6 | '1276 | 23 | 21 | 1.6 |
| Sacramento | 3132 | 71 | 51 | 1.6 | 3587 | 86(3) | 66 | 1.8 |
| San Diego | 4795 | 15 | 14 | .3 | 5767 | 13 | 11 | .3 |
| San Fernando | 3620 | 68 | 53 | 1.5 | 3959 | 69 | 55 | 1.4 |
| San Francisco | 6422 | 6 | 6 | .1 | 5539 | 43(43) | 43 | .8 |
| San Jose | 7223 | 69 | 61 | .8 | 8031 | 51(9) | 45 | .6 |
| Sonoma | 593 | 10 | 6 | 1.0 | 865 | 16 | 15 | 1.7 |
| Stanislaus | 469 | 10 | 10 | 2.1 | 542 | 11 | 11 | 2.0 |
| SYSTEMWIDE | 49,902 | 562(33) | 426 | .9 | 57,940 | 572(93) | 480 | .8 |

PRELIMINARY REPORT ON USE OF TWO PERCENT EXCEPTION PROVISIONS IN THE CALIFORNIA STATE COLLEGES (December, 1967), 1967, Los Angeles, California, The California State Colleges. (An unpublished document prepared for the Coordinating Council for Higher Education), December, 1967.

## APPENDIX III-C

### THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA
### EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITY PROGRAM - DISTRIBUTION BY CAMPUS
(Based on Budget Office Yearly Average) (1)

| | | 1968-1969 | | | Estimated 1969-1970 | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Campus | Undergrad. | Grad. | Total | Undergrad. | Grad. | Total |
| Berkeley | 750 | 317 | 1067 | 1290 | 560 | 1850 |
| Davis | 224 | 11 | 235 | 385 | 15 | 400 |
| Irvine | 40 | -- | 40 | 115 | -- | 115 |
| Los Angeles | 750 | 231 | 981 | 1500 | 260 | 1760 |
| Riverside | 80 | -- | 80 | 167 | 10 | 177 |
| San Diego | 84 | 1 | 85 | 212 | 12 | 224 |
| San Francisco | 60 | -- | 60 | 185 | -- | 185 |
| Santa Barbara | 266 | 4 | 270 | 457 | 7 | 464 |
| Santa Cruz | 47 | -- | 47 | 120 | -- | 120 |
| TOTALS | 2301 | 564 | 2865 | 4431 | 864 | 5295 |

SOURCE: Office of the President, Undergraduate Economic Opportunity Program - 1968-1969, University of California, Berkeley, California (Draft number one (1); Dated September 29, 1969. An unpublished document. September, 1969.

(a) Average yearly figures for Budget Office purposes are slightly higher than Fall Quarter 1968 figure of 2038.

APPENDIX III-D

## CALIFORNIA STATE COLLEGES
## BASIS OF ADMISSION, FALL 1969, STATE FUNDED EOP ENROLLEES

| College | Fresh. Exceptions | Trans. Exceptions | Other Trans. Special | Fresh. Reg. | Trans. Reg. | Unknown | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Chico | 77 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 86 |
| Dominguez Hills | 43 | 27 | 4 | 0 | 3 | | 77 |
| Fresno | 103 | 33 | 6 | 0 | 0 | | 142 |
| Fullerton | 127 | 23 | 4 | 21 | 6 | | 181 |
| Hayward | 86 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 100 |
| Humboldt | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 0 |
| Kellogg-Voorhis | 47 | 11 | 5 | 0 | 1 | 8 | 72 |
| Long Beach | 233 | 26 | 53 | 0 | 0 | | 312 |
| Los Angeles | 290 | 153 | 39 | 1 | 1 | | 484 |
| Sacramento | 92 | 62 | 12 | 0 | 0 | | 166 |
| San Bernardino | 17 | 12 | 3 | 1 | 1 | | 34 |
| San Diego | 96 | 66 | 4 | 0 | 0 | | 166 |
| San Fernando | 252 | 84 | 12 | 9 | 20 | 3 | 380 |
| San Francisco | 123 | 132 | 27 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 285 |
| San Jose | 241 | 102 | 22 | 0 | 0 | | 365 |
| San Luis Obispo | 19 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 1 | | 24 |
| Sonoma | 14 | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | 34 |
| Stanislaus | 15 | 3 | 5 | 9 | 3 | | 35 |
| Total | 1875 | 779 | 196 | 43 | 36 | 14 | 2943 |

(August, 1970)

## APPENDIX III-E

## CALIFORNIA STATE COLLEGES
## E.O.P. ENROLLMENT, 1969-70

| College | -1-<br>New Fall Enrollment* | -2-<br>New Winter/ Spring Enr. | -3-<br>Avg. Annual New Enr.** |
|---|---|---|---|
| Chico | 86 | 4 | 82 |
| Dominguez Hills | 77 | 26 | 87 |
| Fresno | 142 | 29 | 151 |
| Fullerton | 181 | 27 | 184 |
| Hayward | 100 | 36 | 114 |
| Humboldt | 0 | 20 | 7 |
| Kellogg-Voorhis | 72 | 39 | 83 |
| Long Beach | 312(98) | 76 | 334 |
| Los Angeles | 484 | 66 | 488 |
| Sacramento | 166(31) | 38 | 181 |
| San Bernardino | 34 | 6 | 36 |
| San Diego | 166(111) | 242 | 324 |
| San Fernando | 380 | 10 | 375 |
| San Francisco | 285 | 0 | 280 |
| San Jose | 365(114) | 88 | 395 |
| San Luis Obispo | 24 | 7 | 27 |
| Sonoma | 34(5) | 0 | 32 |
| Stanislaus | 35 | 5 | 37 |
| Total | 2,943(359) | 719 | 3,217*** |

*Figures in parentheses represent students meeting regular admission requirements who received program assistance as a result of private contributions.

**Average annual figures are estimated to the extent that fall to winter/spring attrition is based upon study involving random samples ranging from 20% to 100%.

***Includes 79 students who met regular admission requirements.

(August, 1970)

## APPENDIX IV-A

## . CALIFORNIA STATE COLLEGES

### FISCAL YEAR 1969-70 EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITY PROGRAM, SUPPORT BUDGET FUNDING, INITIAL ALLOCATION, REALLOCATION, AND ACTUAL EXPENDITURES, BY COLLEGE AND SYSTEMWIDE

| College | Initial Allocations | | Adjusted Allocations | | Actual Expenditures | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Program Support | Grants | Program Support | Grants | Program Support | Grants |
| Bakersfield | $ -- | $ -- | $ 6,361 | $ -- | $ 2,594 | $ -- |
| Dominguez Hills | 52,494 | 39,000 | 54,884 | 28,380 | 54,215 | 26,380 |
| Fullerton | 60,993 | 60,000 | 60,993 | 43,800 | 49,710 | 43,800 |
| Hayward | 61,602 | 58,000 | 61,602 | 58,000 | 45,318 | 58,000 |
| Long Beach | 79,572 | 93,000 | 79,572 | 111,400 | 75,134 | 111,400 |
| Los Angeles | 89,403 | 150,000 | 100,853 | 146,800 | 85,977 | 146,175 |
| San Bernardino | 27,257 | 15,000 | 27,257 | 16,500 | 28,402 | 15,679 |
| Cal Poly, K.V. | 30,392 | 30,000 | 45,313 | 45,000 | 41,413 | 45,000 |
| Cal Poly, SLO. | 32,212 | 30,000 | 27,467 | 15,000 | 17,313 | 15,000 |
| Chico | 46,884 | 39,000 | 46,884 | 39,000 | 46,262 | 39,000 |
| Fresno | 61,577 | 60,000 | 61,577 | 60,000 | 48,912 | 60,950 |
| Humboldt | 21,568 | 9,000 | 21,568 | 4,500 | 13,907 | 4,500 |
| Sacramento | 61,159 | 58,000 | 66,045 | 66,000 | 61,466 | 66,000 |
| San Diego | 101,361 | 125,000 | 101,361 | 106,650 | 85,098 | 106,650 |
| San Fernando Valley | 108,085 | 144,000 | 108,085 | 182,500 | 93,696 | 182,509 |
| San Francisco | 90,781 | 106,000 | 90,781 | 106,000 | 80,624 | 106,000 |
| San Jose | 110,396 | 163,000 | 113,727 | 163,000 | 85,214 | 163,000 |
| Sonoma | 34,485 | 16,000 | 34,485 | 20,400 | 29,838 | 20,400 |
| Stanislaus | 26,354 | 15,000 | 26,354 | 15,000 | 25,931 | 14,995 |
| Chancellor's Office | 53,494 | -- | 36,970 | -- | 25,207 | -- |
| Sub-total | 1,150,069 | 1,210,000 | 1,172,139 | 1,228,130 | 996,231 | 1,225,438 |
| Unallocated | 40,000 | | -- | | -- | |
| Total | $2,400,069 | | $2,400,069 | | $2,221,669 | |

Source: Coordinating Council for Higher Education, *Educational Opportunity Programs in California Public Higher Education, 1969-1970*, Sacramento, CA (Council Report 71-5, an unpublished document), April, 1971.

## APPENDIX IV-B

## CALIFORNIA STATE COLLEGES
## SUMMARY OF FINANCIAL AID EXPENDITURES FOR NEW EOP STUDENTS, 1969-70

| College | Individuals Aided | Total of Aid Funds Used | Amt. from State* | Amt. from Fed. Govt.** | Amt. from Private |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Dominguez | 66 | $ 49,438 | $ 23,750 | $ 23,617 | $ 2,069 |
| Fullerton | 158 | 188,069 | 52,296 | 122,089 | 13,684 |
| Hayward | 102 | 113,581 | 47,246 | 65,135 | 1,200 |
| Long Beach | 309 | 383,716 | 120,630 | 258,993 | 4,093 |
| Los Angeles | 372 | 454,750 | 167,412 | 277,463 | 9,875 |
| San Bernardino | 40 | 47,535 | 17,838 | 28,997 | 700 |
| Cal Poly, K.V. | 111 | 145,531 | 58,097 | 84,634 | 2,800 |
| Cal Poly, SLO. | 31 | 44,275 | 14,069 | 25,363 | 4,843 |
| Chico | 86 | 155,430 | 43,360 | 111,470 | 600 |
| Fresno | 171 | 254,141 | 57,690 | 178,051 | 18,400 |
| Humboldt | 20 | 12,375 | 4,589 | 5,640 | 2,146 |
| Sacramento | 154 | 214,664 | 66,814 | 73,557 | 74,293 |
| San Diego | 350 | 479,010 | 127,682 | 349,778 | 1,550 |
| San Fernando Valley | 390 | 695,489 | 275,002 | 410,822 | 9,665 |
| San Francisco | 238 | 459,719 | 134,043 | 305,188 | 20,488 |
| San Jose | 480 | 849,471 | 186,361 | 637,533 | 25,577 |
| Sonoma | 37 | 64,972 | 22,253 | 42,719 | --- |
| Stanislaus | 40 | 55,814 | 17,390 | 37,907 | 517 |
| Systemwide | 3,155 | $4,667,930 | $1,436,524 | $3,038,956 | $192,500 |

* Consists of E.O.P. Grant Funds budgeted directly to the system, a limited amount of College Opportunity Grant Funds and an estimate of State funds used to match NDSL Loans and Federal College Work-Study Funds.

** NDSL Loans, E.O.G., C.W.S., L.E.E.P. Loans and Grants and Federal Guaranteed Loans.

Source: Same, April, 1971

## APPENDIX IV-C

## UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA
## SOURCES OF STUDENT FINANCIAL AID

### Undergraduate Educational Opportunity Program 1969-70

| Campus | State* | University** | Federal | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Berkeley | $ 8,900 | $ 878,594 | $ 1,554,330 | $ 2,441,824 |
| Davis | -- | 742,115 | 163,347 | 905,462 |
| Irvine | 300 | 129,717 | 57,980 | 187,997 |
| Los Angeles | -- | 662,895 | 808,003 | 1,470,898 |
| Riverside | 3,300 | 164,772 | 131,833 | 299,905 |
| San Diego | 4,918 | 166,311 | 117,894 | 289,123 |
| Santa Barbara | 7,800 | 289,048 | 610,448 | 907,296 |
| Santa Cruz | -- | 216,667 | 117,468 | 334,135 |
| Total | $25,218 | $3,250,119 | $3,561,303 | $6,836,640 |
| Percent of Total: | 0.37 | 47.54 | 52.09 | |

* California State Scholarships and College Opportunity Grants
** All non-Federal and non-State funds

(April, 1971)

# APPENDIX IV-D

## UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA
## ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS AND STUDENT FINANCIAL AID
## UNDERGRADUATE EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITY PROGRAM, 1969-70
## COST PER STUDENT

| Campus | Total EOP Budget | Total Cost Pr/Student | | Administrative Cost | | Tutoring & Counseling | | Grants & Scholarships | | Loans | | Work Study | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Cost Pr/Std. | No. Stds. | Cost Pr/Std. | No. Stds. | Cost Pr. Std. | No. Stds. | Aver. Amt/Std. | No. Stds. | Aver. Amt/Std. | No. Stds. | Aver. Amt/Std. | No. Stds. |
| Berkeley | $2,709,555 | $2095 | 1293 | $ 66 | 1293 | $ 205 | 890 | $1197 | 1137 | $ 899 | 1022 | $ 734 | 220 |
| Davis | 1,063,843 | 2770 | 384 | 244 | 384 | 172 | 376 | 2351 | 376 | 436 | 4 | 474 | 42 |
| Irvine | 263,636 | 2253 | 117 | 221 | 117 | 425 | 117 | 1458 | 117 | 833 | 6 | 656 | 19 |
| Los Angeles | 1,643,130 | 1802 | 912 | 83 | 912 | 132 | 727 | 953 | 912 | 565 | 912 | 769 | 113 |
| Riverside | 366,293 | 2394 | 153 | 288 | 153 | 283 | 79 | 1585 | 152 | 481 | 34 | 776 | 55 |
| San Diego | 437,613 | 2340 | 187 | 397 | 187 | 397 | 187 | 1168 | 181 | 612 | 45 | 837 | 60 |
| Santa Barbara | 1,028,534 | 2236 | 460 | 190 | 460 | 435 | 78 | 1252 | 431 | 582 | 353 | 1638 | 99 |
| Santa Cruz | 406,689 | 2676 | 152 | 212 | 152 | 271 | 149 | 1460 | 149 | 492 | 149 | 291 | 149 |

(April, 1971)

# APPENDIX IV-E

## EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITY PROGRAM SUPPORT IN CALIFORNIA STATE COLLEGES, 1969-70

| Colleges | Admin. Allocated | Admin. Committed | EOP Grants Allocated | EOP Grants Committed | EOP Students Allocated | EOP Students Enrolled | Students Rec'ing EOP Grants | Uncommitted Admin. Funds | Grant Funds Reserved for Spring Enrollees |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Dominguez Hills | $ 43,326 | $ 43,326 | $ 39,000 | $ 22,000 | 90 | 90 | 32 | -0- | $ 17,000 |
| Hayward | 55,432 | 50,763 | 58,000 | 30,500 | 145 | 103 | 54 | 4,469 | 27,500 |
| Fullerton | 55,593 | 42,832 | 60,000 | 46,650 | 150 | 198 | 76 | 12,761 | 13,350 |
| Long Beach | 73,939 | 73,939 | 93,000 | 93,000 | 240 | 240 | 148 | -0- | -0- |
| Los Angeles | 84,251 | 84,251 | 150,000 | 150,000 | 420 | 460 | 249 | -0- | -0- |
| San Bernardino | 24,726 | 24,718 | 15,000 | 15,000 | 35 | 50 | 29 | -0- | -0- |
| Pomona | 27,437 | 24,168 | 44,000 | 30,000 | 110 | 131 | 61 | 3,269 | 14,000 |
| San Luis Obispo | 27,495 | 16,527 | 15,000 | 10,050 | 35 | 33 | 15 | 10,968 | 4,950 |
| Chico | 42,308 | 41,940 | 39,000 | 39,000 | 90 | 76 | 76 | 368 | -0- |
| Fresno | 54,778 | 54,778 | 60,000 | 60,000 | 150 | 179 | 150 | -0- | -0- |
| Sacramento | 54,760 | 54,760 | 58,000 | 58,000 | 145 | 202 | 127 | -0- | -0- |
| San Diego | 93,053 | 93,053 | 125,000 | 82,000 | 335 | 275 | 135 | -0- | 43,000 |
| San Fernando | 101,937 | 101,937 | 144,000 | 143,109 | 385 | 385 | 380 | -0- | 891 |
| San Francisco | 80,913 | 80,913 | 106,000 | 92,000 | 275 | 275 | 160 | -0- | 14,000 |
| San Jose | 104,010 | 104,010 | 163,000 | 134,200 | 450 | 410 | 238 | -0- | 28,800 |
| Sonoma | 31,428 | 31,313 | 16,000 | 17,400 | 40 | 64 | 27 | 115 | (1400) |
| Stanislaus | 23,663 | 21,681 | 15,000 | 15,000 | 35 | 42 | 26 | 1,092 | -0- |
| Chancellor's Office | 31,113 | 31,113 | 41,000 | | | | | -0- | 41,000 |
| Totals | 1,028,454 | 976,022 | 1,250,000 | 1,037,909 | 3150 | 3213 | 1983 | 51,435 | 212,091 |

(Office of the President, January, 1971)

# APPENDIX IV-E

## EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITY PROGRAM SUPPORT IN CALIFORNIA STATE COLLEGES, 1969-70
Part 2

| Colleges | NDSL | Work Study | EOG | Private | Assoc. Students | Faculty Contrib. | Private Grants | Special Federal Program |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Dominguez Hills | $ 2,000 | $ 3,000 | $19,000 | $ -0- | $ 3,100 | $ -0- | $ 400 | $ |
| Hayward | 22,850 | 3,840 | 14,550 | 1,900 | -0- | -0- | -0- | |
| Fullerton | 79,130 | 19,266 | 58,076 | 7,202 | 26,914 | 600 | 286 | |
| Long Beach | 77,000 | 14,000 | 77,000 | 6,000 | 6,000 | -0- | -0- | |
| Los Angeles | 120,000 | 52,816 | 100,000 | -0- | -0- | -0- | -0- | |
| San Bernardino | 10,930 | 3,829 | 11,150 | 400 | -0- | -0- | -0- | |
| Pomona | 42,250 | 17,000 | 25,400 | 725 | -0- | -0- | -0- | |
| San Luis Obispo | 3,750 | -0- | 11,350 | -0- | -0- | -0- | -0- | |
| Chico | 34,905 | 450 | 67,700 | 20,000 | 3,600 | 645 | 100 | |
| Fresno | 70,000 | 40,000 | 85,000 | 25,000 | 45,000 | 1,000 | 5,000 | |
| Sacramento | -0- | -0- | -0- | -0- | -0- | -0- | -0- | |
| San Diego | -0- | 8,000 | 59,400 | -0- | 30,000 | 10,000 | 65,500 | |
| San Fernando | 54,400 | 15,294 | 74,000 | -0- | -0- | -0- | -0- | |
| San Francisco | 195,000 | 120,000 | 220,000 | 8,000 | -0- | -0- | -0- | |
| San Jose | 3,600 | 127,400 | 115,225 | -0- | -0- | -0- | -0- | |
| Sonoma | 76,526 | 24,552 | 152,500 | 1,600 | 19,000 | -0- | -0- | 100,000 |
| Stanislaus | 12,000 | 2,650 | 18,500 | 2,400 | 5,000 | 328 | 108 | |
| Chancellor's Office | 22,005 | 12,239 | 30,000 | -0- | -0- | -0- | -0- | |
| Totals | 826,366 | 464,336 | 1,138,851 | 73,227 | 138,614 | 12,573 | 71,394 | 100,000 |

(Office of the President, January, 1971)

## APPENDIX IV-F

## THE CALIFORNIA STATE COLLEGES
## EOP ENROLLMENT, PROJECTIONS AND PROGRAM COSTS, 1969-70 THROUGH 1971-72

| College | 1969-70 New Enrollees | 1969-70 Program Costs* | 1970-71 New Enrollees | 1970-71 Program Costs* | 1971-72 New Enrollees | 1971-72 Program Costs* |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Chico | 82 | $ 48,412 | 95 | $ 59,159 | 100 | $ 65,000 |
| Dominguez Hills | 87 | 54,703 | 100 | 56,488 | 100 | 60,000 |
| Fresno | 151 | 63,297 | 150 | 74,858 | 165 | 80,000 |
| Fullerton | 184 | 62,578 | 160 | 72,832 | 160 | 78,000 |
| Hayward | 114 | 63,604 | 160 | 73,722 | 160 | 80,000 |
| Humboldt | 7 | 13,904 | 30 | 27,186 | 60 | 44,000 |
| Kellogg-Voorhis | 77 | 41,974 | 95 | 55,000 | 100 | 58,000 |
| Long Beach | 334 | 82,452 | 300 | 99,760 | 340 | 110,000 |
| Los Angeles | 488 | 103,895 | 475 | 128,728 | 475 | 135,000 |
| Sacramento | 181 | 63,137 | 160 | 74,624 | 160 | 80,000 |
| San Bernardino | 36 | 28,150 | 50 | 36,433 | 75 | 42,000 |
| San Diego | 324 | 105,461 | 350 | 115,350 | 365 | 125,000 |
| San Fernando | 375 | 111,909 | 443 | 128,078 | 460 | 134,000 |
| San Francisco | 280 | 94,251 | 275 | 96,319 | 300 | 100,000 |
| San Jose | 395 | 104,010 | 465 | 135,349 | 465 | 143,000 |
| San Luis Obispo | 27 | 19,000 | 70 | 45,000 | 90 | 53,000 |
| Sonoma | 32 | 35,619 | 60 | 38,923 | 75 | 43,000 |
| Stanislaus | 37 | 27,378 | 50 | 36,702 | 75 | 40,000 |
| Total | 3,217 | $1,123,734 | 3,500 | $1,354,511 | 3,755 | $1,470,000 |

*Program Cost figures are not adjusted for salary savings and staff benefits.

Source: Summary of August 15, 1970 Educational Opportunity Program, Los Angeles, California, The California State Colleges. A report prepared for the Coordinating Council for Higher Education, an unpublished document. August, 1970.

APPENDIX IV-G

EOP FINANCIAL AID EXPENDITURES AND PROJECTIONS*

| College | 1969/70 |  |  |  | 1970/71 |  | 1971/72 |  |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
|  | No. Aided | Total Aid | State Grants | Aug. Pkgs. | No. Aided | Total Aid | No. Aided | Total Aid |
| Chico | 86 | $ 155,430 | $ 39,225 | $ 1,800 | 161 | $ 297,850 | 229 | $ 435,100 |
| Dominguez Hills | 66 | 49,433 | 22,440 | 750 | 190 | 187,000 | 235 | 270,250 |
| Fresno | 171 | 254,141 | 47,350 | 1,486 | 270 | 405,000 | 381 | 590,550 |
| Fullerton | 153 | 188,069 | 42,675 | 1,190 | 290 | 362,500 | 390 | 507,000 |
| Hayward | 102 | 113,581 | 41,200 | 1,113 | 250 | 287,500 | 360 | 432,000 |
| Humboldt | 20 | 12,375 | 4,487 | N/A | 45 | 81,000 | 95 | 175,750 |
| Kellogg-Voorhis | 111 | 145,531 | 46,121 | 1,311 | 157 | 211,950 | 226 | 316,400 |
| Long Beach | 309 | 383,716 | 102,704 | 1,242 | 567 | 737,100 | 790 | 1,066,500 |
| Los Angeles | 372 | 454,750 | 145,425 | 1,223 | 825 | 1,072,500 | 1,135 | 1,532,250 |
| Sacramento | 154 | 214,664 | 63,971 | 1,394 | 300 | 435,000 | 400 | 600,000 |
| San Bernardino | 40 | 47,535 | 15,929 | 1,188 | 78 | 97,500 | 137 | 178,100 |
| San Diego | 350 | 479,010 | 97,630 | 1,369 | 590 | 826,000 | 835 | 1,210,750 |
| San Fernando Valley | 390 | 695,489 | 166,242 | 1,783 | 750 | 1,350,000 | 1,060 | 1,961,000 |
| San Francisco | 238 | 459,719 | 103,150 | 1,932 | 475 | 926,250 | 685 | 1,370,000 |
| San Jose | 480 | 849,471 | 147,499 | 1,769 | 780 | 1,404,000 | 1,050 | 1,942,500 |
| San Luis Obispo | 31 | 44,275 | 13,028 | 1,331 | 92 | 128,800 | 164 | 237,800 |
| Sonoma | 37 | 64,972 | 19,400 | 1,756 | 85 | 153,000 | 147 | 271,950 |
| Stanislaus | 40 | 55,814 | 15,561 | 1,395 | 80 | 110,000 | 139 | 210,000 |
| Total | 3,155 | $4,667,980 | $1,134,037 | $ 1,486 | 5,965 | $9,072,950 | 8,458 | $13,307,900 |

*1969/70 figures are for first year enrollees, 1970/71 are for first year and second year students, 1971/72 are for first, second and third year students.

(August, 1970)

## APPENDIX IV-H

## UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA
## SOURCES OF STUDENT FINANCIAL AID

### Undergraduate Educational Opportunity Program 1970-71

| Campus | University | Federal | Total |
|---|---|---|---|
| Berkeley | $1,395,000 | $1,105,000 | $2,500,000 |
| Davis | 733,000 | 175,000 | 908,000 |
| Irvine | 252,000 | 149,000 | 401,000 |
| Los Angeles | 981,000 | 1,408,000 | 2,389,000 |
| Riverside | 316,000 | 178,000 | 494,000 |
| San Diego | 361,000 | 280,000 | 641,000 |
| Santa Barbara | 451,000 | 753,000 | 1,204,000 |
| Santa Cruz | 191,000 | 122,000 | 313,000 |
| Total | $4,680,000 | $4,170,000 | $8,850,000 |

(January, 1972)

## APPENDIX IV-I

## UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA
## ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENDITURES AND STUDENT FINANCIAL AID
## UNDERGRADUATE EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITY PROGRAM, 1970-71
## COST PER STUDENT

| | Total Cost Pr/Student | | Administrative Cost (*) | | Scholarships | | Grants | | Loans | | Work Study | | Educational Fee Deferments | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Campus | Cost Pr/Std. | No. Stds. | Cost Pr/Std. | No. Stds. | Aver. Amt/Std. | No. Stds. | Aver. Amt/Std. | No. Stds. | Aver. Amt/Std. | No. Stds. | Aver. Amt/Std. | No. Stds. | Aver. Amt/Std. | No. Stds. |
| Berkeley | $1,860 | 1,550 | $ 340 | 1,550 | $ 729 | 56 | $ 1,402 | 1,117 | $ 605 | 875 | $ 731 | 267 | $ 136 | 1,225 |
| Davis | 2,306 | 464 | 350 | 464 | 695 | 8 | 2,067 | 403 | 379 | 10 | 589 | 23 | 138 | 376 |
| Irvine | 2,023 | 252 | 431 | 252 | 349 | 22 | 1,386 | 210 | 688 | 62 | 421 | 84 | 136 | 180 |
| Los Angeles | 1,888 | 1,444 | 264 | 1,444 | 488 | 56 | 1,033 | 1,288 | 618 | 1,039 | 703 | 326 | 132 | 1,194 |
| Riverside | 1,461 | 233 | 374 | 233 | 525 | 8 | 1,749 | 214 | 545 | 116 | 385 | 70 | 135 | 190 |
| San Diego | 1,767 | 434 | 289 | 434 | 378 | 10 | 1,089 | 367 | 588 | 128 | 660 | 187 | 133 | 290 |
| Santa Barbara | 2,099 | 642 | 221 | 642 | 234 | 25 | 1,146 | 589 | 486 | 497 | 902 | 236 | 133 | 518 |
| Santa Cruz | 1,752 | 202 | 203 | 202 | 862 | 47 | 1,115 | 134 | 508 | 98 | 889 | 60 | 114 | 136 |

(*) Includes Tutoring and Counseling

(January, 1972)

# APPENDIX IV-J

## SOME SOURCES OF INFORMATION ON STUDENT AID

The growing interest in, and financial support of, student aid programs on the part of the federal government, states, business and industry, foundations, a variety of other groups, and private individuals is encouraging. However, the number of applicants is constantly increasing; the competition is very high by traditional standards. Moreover, real effort may be needed in the search. Although the opportunities for financial help are many and varied, frequently they are not brought to the attention of students who might benefit from them. It often happens that students learn only of well-publicized national competitions or of those opportunities available at a nearby college or university. Economically oppressed individuals of ethnic minority groups make up a disproportionate number of those lacking in sufficient knowledge of how to secure financial help.

### Types of Student Aid

A scholarship is an outright grant of money, tuition discount, remission of tuition and fees, or a similar consideration which does not require repayment or a service to be performed by the student. It is usually awarded on the basis of superior academic performance or potential.

A fellowship is an outright award of money or other financial consideration given to a graduate student for further study or research in a specified field. It is generally awarded on the basis of superior academic performance.

A service grant-in-aid is a grant of money, tuition discount, remission of tuition and fees, or similar consideration which is awarded in return for services rendered to the institution.

A loan is a sum of money advanced for the payment of college expenses. Interest is usually low, and repayment is expected in a reasonable time after graduation.

## Colleges and Universities

Of the approximately 2,500 colleges and universities in the United States, most offer scholarships or other types of financial aid. Admission requirements, as well as programs and financial aid offered, vary from institution to institution. Many colleges which have an extensive financial aid program also have high admission requirements. The basic source of information on financial aid and admission requirements is the college catalogue which is ordinarily supplied upon request.

## Federal Government

As noted earlier, a general program of financial assistance through the federal government was authorized under the National Defense Education Act of 1958. With the passage of the Higher Education Act of 1965, and the Education Professions Development Act of 1967, and H.E. Amendment 1968, student aid opportunities have been greatly expanded to include scholarships, fellowships, grants, and work-study programs, as well as loans.

Educational Opportunity Grants. This is a program of direct awards for undergraduate students of exceptional financial need. Eligible students who have been accepted for enrollment in a college or university on a full-time basis or who are currently enrolled may receive from $200 to $1,000 a year. Institutions of higher education participating in the program select the recipient and determine the amount each student needs in accordance with criteria established by the U.S. Office of Education. Students interested in applying for a grant may see or write to the Director of Student Financial Aid at the college or university to which he or she is applying, or in which he is enrolled.

Guaranteed Loans for College and Vocational Students. Under this loan program, students borrow directly from a bank, savings and loan association, credit union, or other participating lender. The general outline was established by federal law, but each state and institution administers the program according to slightly different procedures. Depending on the students' year in school, they may borrow up to a maximum of $1,000 to $1,500. If the adjusted family income is under $15,000 per year, the federal government will pay the full interest charged on this loan while the student is attending school, and prior to the beginning of the repayment period. Repayment begins on a date between nine and 12 months after the student has completed his course of study or leaves school.[1] The maximum repayment period is 10 years, but minimum repayment requirements may reduce this time. Deferment of repayment may be authorized for service in the military, Peace Corps, or VISTA, or for any period that the student returns to full-time study. A list of agencies administering the program in each state may be obtained from the Division of Student Financial Aid, Office of Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Washington, D.C. 20202. However, necessary application forms should be requested from the state guarantee agency, lender, or student financial aid officer at the institution in which the student is enrolled or has been accepted for enrollment.

---

[1] Helen Kolodziey, Sources of Information on Student Aid, Research Division, National Education Association, Washington, D.C., 1970, p. 5.

College Work-Study. The work-study program under the Economic Opportunity Act has been transferred from the Office of Economic Opportunity to the Office of Education, and expanded. Students may work up to 15 hours per week while attending classes full time, and 40 hours per week during the summer or other vacation periods. Work may be for the institution attended by the student or for an approved off-campus agency. A student who wishes to participate in this program should see or write to the Director of Student Financial Aid at the institution he plans to attend.

National Defense Student Loan Program (NDEA, as amended). Under this program undergraduate students may borrow up to $1,000 each academic year, and graduate students may borrow as much as $2,500 per year. The repayment period and interest do not begin until nine months after his studies have been completed. The loans bear interest at the rate of three percent per year, and repayment of principal may be extended over a ten-year period. If a borrower becomes a full-time teacher in an elementary or secondary school or in an institution of higher education, as much as half of the loan may be forgiven at the rate of ten percent for each year of full-time teaching service. Borrowers who elect to teach handicapped children or to teach in a school designated as having a high concentration of pupils from low-income families may qualify for cancellation at the rate of 15 percent of their total loan for each year of teaching service, with no limitation on the number of cancellable years. A borrower need make no repayment of principal or interest, nor does interest accrue, for up to three years while he is serving in the Armed Forces, Peace Corps, or VISTA, or during any period while he is continuing his course of study at an eligible institution.

National Defense Graduate Fellowship Program. College graduates planning to teach in colleges and universities are eligible. Fellowships are awarded for full-time study in approved graduate programs leading to a doctorate in virtually all fields of instruction. The stipends are $2,400 for the first academic year of study, $2,600 for the second, and $2,800 for the third, together with an allowance of $500 a year for each dependent. Application forms for the fellowships should be obtained directly from the graduate schools offering approved programs. A list of the participating schools may be obtained from the Graduate Academic Programs Branch, Bureau of Higher Education, Office of Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Washington, D.C., 20202.

Education Professions Development Act. The U.S. Office of Education publishes early each calendar year a list of both preservice and inservice training projects for educational personnel in fields such as early childhood education, pupil personnel services, and school administration, to be conducted during the coming summer and academic year. Copies may be obtained through correspondence with the Bureau of Educational Personnel Development, Office of Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Washington, D.C. 20202.

Teacher Corps. This program is authorized for undergraduate or graduate students interested in working in poverty area schools. Colleges and universities, in cooperation with one or more local school systems having a concentration of low-income families, conduct two-year work-study programs. Tuition and university costs are paid by federal grants. During their teaching-study period the Teacher Corps interns are paid $75 per week by the local school district, 90 percent of which comes from the federal government. The combination of study and inservice training leads to a bachelor's or master's degree and teacher certification. Further information may be obtained from the Teacher Corps, Bureau of Educational Personnel Development, Office of Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Washington, D.C. 20202.

Education of Handicapped Children Scholarship Program. These scholarships are provided through colleges, universities, and state educational agencies to encourage persons to prepare, or to improve their competencies, for positions in the education of handicapped children as teachers, speech correctionists, supervisors or administrators, other specialists providing special services, professors for institutions of higher education, and researchers. Scholarship award areas are the mentally retarded, deaf, speech and hearing impaired, visually handicapped, recreation, physical education, learning disabilities, administration of special education.

Undergraduate traineeships are for one academic year of study at the junior or senior year level. Junior year trainees receive a stipend of $300; senior year trainees, $800.

Graduate fellowships are for one academic year of full-time study. An individual may be awarded a total of four fellowships under this program. Master's level recipients receive $2,200 plus $600 for each dependent; recipients of post-master's level fellowships receive $3,200 plus $600 for each dependent.

. A list of these participating institutions and agencies may be obtained from the Division of Training Programs, Bureau of Education for the Handicapped, Office of Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Washington, D.C. 20202.

Fulbright-Hays Act. Opportunities of various types exist under the Fulbright-Hays Act for federally financed post-graduate study, and teaching and lecturing abroad. Candidates are screened locally, but final selection is made by a central authority. Many countries are now included under these programs. Specific details about the various types of programs currently open may be obtained by addressing an inquiry to the appropriate agency below:

For university lecturing and postdoctoral research - Conference Board of Associated Research Councils, 2101 Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20418.

For predoctoral study or research - Institute of International Education, United States Student Program, 809 United Nations Plaza, New York, New York 10017

For teaching abroad in elementary and secondary schools and for modern language and area studies training and research - Division of International Exchange and Training, Office of Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Washington, D.C. 20202.

National Science Foundation. Created by an Act of Congress in 1950, the National Science Foundation, an independent agency of the federal government, awards postdoctoral fellowships, as well as fellowships for study or work leading to masters' or doctoral degrees in the mathematical, physical, medical, biological, engineering and social sciences, and in the history and philosophy of science. Detailed information and applications may be obtained from the Fellowship Office, National Academy of Sciences, National Research Council, 2101 Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20418.

The foundation also administers a Science Faculty Fellowship program for college teachers of science, mathematics, or engineering with at least three years of experience in full-time teaching at the college level who wish to enhance their effectiveness as teachers. Application materials and detailed information may be obtained from the

Division of Graduate Education in Science, National Science Foundation, Washington, D.C. 20550.

In addition, the NSF supports training opportunities for secondary-school teachers of science and mathematics. These are Summer, Academic Year, and In-Service Institutes, and Cooperative College-School Science Programs. Programs are conducted by colleges and universities which select participants. Brief descriptions of these programs and information on when and where to apply may be obtained from the Division of Pre-College Education in Science, National Science Foundation, 1800 G Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20550.

Among other federal agencies which offer programs of awards are the Department of the Interior, Department of Commerce, Atomic Energy Commission, Veterans Administration, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, and U.S. Public Health Service. Inquiries should be addressed to the individual agency.

## State Governments

Most states have established financial assistance programs for students to attend institutions within the state. The assistance may be in the form of a scholarship, grant-in-aid, or loan. Eligibility requirements vary, and awards may be based on such factors as the passing of a competitive examination, scholastic record in high school, or family income. In most cases, school counselors will be able to provide information on opportunities provided by the state, or details may be obtained by writing to the state department of education of the state in which the student resides. With the exception of Maryland, whose state department of education is located in Baltimore, the departments may be addressed in care of the capital cities.

Local Agencies

The student should also investigate opportunities by local agencies. The following are possible sources of scholarships or loans: Civic and fraternal organizations, religious organizations and churches, college alumni groups, PTA groups and local teachers associations, business and industrial firms, unions, and American Legion Posts and Units of the Auxiliary.

National Education Association

The NEA does not have a scholarship program. However, several of its related national groups conduct or administer programs of awards.

The American Association for Health, Physical Education, and Recreation is cooperating with interested organizations in sponsoring a program of scholarship assistance for high-school seniors of unusual promise who plan to prepare for a teaching career in physical education. In 1970, three $2,000 scholarships and seven $1,000 scholarships were awarded. Additional information may be obtained from the AAHPER Scholarship Department.

Association for Educational Communications Technology. A scholarship program is administered by the Awards and Scholarship Committee of AECT, and each spring a scholarship of $1,000 in cash is awarded to an individual who has distinguished himself in the educational media field. For more information and application blank, students should write to the AECT office.

National Association of Secondary School Principals. This association administers the National Honor Society Scholarship Program. There will be a total of 185 scholarships of $1,000 each, provided by the NASSP and other sponsors. Information on this program is available from local high school principals or counselors. Only members of the National Honor Society are eligible. Each participating chapter nominates two senior members.

William G. Carr Scholarship Fund. This fund was established in honor of the former NEA executive secretary. An annual scholarship of $1,500 is awarded for graduate study in either of two areas: (a) the development of effective and independent professional education associations, and (b) the field of international education. Applications should be addressed to the William G. Carr Scholarship Fund Committee at NEA Center.

### Other National Scholarship Programs

National Merit Scholarship Program. About 3,000 Merit Scholarships are offered annually to students planning to attend a regionally accredited U.S. college or university and planning a course of study leading to one of the usual baccalaureate degrees. Amount: 1,000 one-time nonrenewable awards of $1,000; about 2,000 four-year renewable awards. Stipends accompanying four-year awards range from $100 to $1,500 per year and are based on the need of the scholarship winners. Eligibility: high school seniors who took the National Merit Scholarship

Qualifying Test in February of their junior year. Students register to take the test with their high school principal or guidance counselor. For further information write to the National Merit Scholarship Corporation, 990 Grove Street, Evanston, Illinois 60201.

National Achievement Scholarship Program for Outstanding Negro Students. About 325 Achievement Scholarships are offered annually to students planning to attend a course of study leading to one of the usual baccalaureate degrees. Amount: 225 one-time nonrenewable awards of $1,000; about 100 four-year renewable awards. Stipends accompanying four-year awards range from $250 to $1,500 per year and are based on the need of the scholarship winner. Eligibility: Open to Black students who are high school seniors and who took the National Merit Scholarship Qualifying Test in February of their junior year. Students may register to take the test with their high-school principal or guidance counselor. For further information write to the National Achievement Scholarship Program, 990 Grove St., Evanston, Illinois 60201. The Achievement Program is administered by the National Merit Scholarship Corporation.

Westinghouse Science Scholarships. In this Science Talent Search, which is conducted by Science Clubs of America, high school seniors submit a report of about 1,000 words on an independent research project, high school records, including national test scores, and personal data. Forty seniors are selected to attend a Science Talent Institute in Washington, D.C., where awards are made. Westinghouse Science Scholarships ranging from $4,000 ($1,000 per year) to $10,000 ($2,500 per year) are awarded to 10 of the contestants attending the

Institute. Westinghouse Science Awards of $250 each are presented to the other 30 contestants.

Local science teachers can supply details on this program. If further information is desired, an interested person may write to Science Clubs of America, 1719 N Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036.

## Additional Sources of Financial Aid for Graduate Study

Foreign Area Fellowship Program. This program is a continuation of the Ford Foundation Foreign Area Training Fellowship Program established in 1952. It is now administered by the Social Science Research Council and the American Council of Learned Societies.

Fellowships are offered for advanced training and research related to five geographic areas: Africa and the Near East; South Asia, Southeast Asia, and East Asia; Latin America and the Caribbean; the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe; and Western Europe. Eligibility requirements for each program vary, but all area programs are particularly interested in supporting projects that will lead to a better understanding of contemporary affairs of the area.

Detailed information on any of the area programs may be obtained from the Foreign Area Fellowship Program, 110 East 59th Street, New York, New York 10022.

American Association of University Women. Fifty fellowship awards ranging from $3,000 to $5,000 are open to qualified American women to enable them to carry out specific studies or projects. Candidates must have fulfilled all requirements for the doctorate except the dissertation by July 1 of the fellowship year. A few awards are available for those who hold the doctorate or who, having attained recognition of scholarship, are engaged in research not leading to a degree.

Fifty international fellowships per year for graduate study or research in the United States are open to women of other countries. The stipend for these awards is $3,000 plus tuition costs. No travel costs are paid.

There are eleven additional fellowships for advanced research in natural sciences and other fields with stipends ranging from $3,000 to $7,500.

Inquiries may be addressed to the Fellowship Office, AAUW Educational Foundation, 2401 Virginia Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20037.

Woodrow Wilson National Fellowship Foundation. With the assistance of the Ford Foundation, this foundation awards fellowships to students of exceptional promise for the first year of graduate study in preparation for a career in college teaching. Primary consideration is given to candidates who propose graduate study in the humanities and social sciences, although students in natural sciences and mathematics are also eligible if they have a clear interest in college teaching.

Fellows receive a stipend of $2,000 and a contribution of up to $1,000 toward tuition and fees. Those with dependent children receive an additional sum of $1,000 for the first child and $250 for each additional child.

Candidates must be nominated by a college faculty member. For details on nomination and selection, consult a local Woodrow Wilson Campus Representative, or write to the Woodrow Wilson National Fellowship Foundation, Box 642, Princeton, New Jersey 08540.

Ford Foundation. Doctoral Fellowships and Advanced Study Fellowships are open to Black Americans, Mexican Americans, Puerto Ricans, and American Indians.

Students are eligible to apply for the Doctoral Fellowships if they have received a bachelor's degree during the 10-year period ending September, 1971, plan to enter graduate school for full-time study leading to a Ph.D. in the humanities, the social sciences, or natural sciences, and intend to enter a career in higher education.

Consideration for Advanced-Study Fellowships is given to persons, who have previously pursued or are now pursuing, graduate study for a doctoral degree in the humanities, social sciences and who are now engaged in, or plan to enter, careers in higher education.

Awards cover tuition and fees, an annual allowance for books and supplies, and a monthly stipend toward living costs.

Inquiries should be addressed to the Advanced-Study Fellowships or to the Doctoral Fellowships, The Ford Foundation, 320 East 43rd Street, New York, New York 10017.

Danforth Foundation has established the following programs:

Danforth Graduate Fellowships open to men and women planning to study for a Ph.D. who desire a career in college teaching. Awards cover required tuition and fees plus dependency allowances, in addition to fellowship stipends based on individual needs. However, stipends may not exceed $1,800 (academic year) for single recipients, or $2,200 (academic year) or $2,950 (calendar year) for married recipients.

Danforth Graduate Fellowships for Women are designated to offer able women whose academic careers have been interrupted an opportunity to undertake masters or doctoral programs in preparation for teaching in secondary schools or colleges. Stipends depend on individual need. The maximum award for 1971-72 was $3,000 plus tuition and fees, or, for heads of families, $4,[illegible]00 plus tuition and fees.

Kent Graduate Fellowships have been awarded by the Danforth Foundation since 1962 to encourage and support selected persons pursuing graduate studies leading to a Ph.D. degree who are preparing for teaching or administration in colleges and universities. Fellowships are based upon individual need, but may not exceed $1,800 (academic year) or $2,400 (calendar year) plus dependency allowances. Tuition and fees are also provided.

## Some Additional Sources for Economic Assistance in Higher Education

"A Listing of Scholarships Available to Black Students, Spanish-speaking Students," published by the Reader Development Program, The Free Library of Philadelphia, 236 North 23rd Street, Philadelphia, PA 19103

"A Selected List of Major Fellowship Opportunities and Aids to Advanced Education for United States Citizens," published by the Fellowship Office, Office of Scientific Personnel, National Research Council, Washington, D.C.

"A Selected List of Major Fellowship Opportunities and Aids to Advanced Education for Foreign Nationals," same address as above.

Macy Foundation, 277 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y. They have information on medical scholarships.

National Medical Fellowships, Inc., 3935 Elm Street, Downers Grove, Ill. 60515. They have a medical scholarship program for Black Americans, Mexican Americans, Puerto Ricans and American Indians.

Council on Legal Education Opportunity, 863 Fair Street, S.W., Atlanta, GA 30314. They have information on law scholarships.

## Some Additional Sources for Foundation Assistance and Programs for Institutions of Higher Education[1]

Baker Trust, 20 Exchange Place, New York, N.Y. 10005

Beaumont Foundation, 800 National City-East Sixth Building, Cleveland, Ohio 44114

Booth Ferris Foundation, 25 Broad Street, New York, N.Y. 10005

Borden Company Foundation, 350 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10017

Carnegie Corporation of New York, 589 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10017

Dana Foundation, Smith Building, Greenwich, Conn.

Donner Foundation, 418 Seven-O-Seven Building, 707 Jefferson Street, Roanoke, VA

Earhart Foundation, 902 First National Building, Ann Arbor, Michigan

Field Foundation, 250 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10017

Foundation of the Litton Industries, 9370 Santa Monica Blvd., Beverly Hills, CA 90210

Gebbie Foundation, 901 Hotel Jamestown Office Building, Jamestown, New York, 14701

Given (Irene Heinz and John Laporte Given) Foundation, 14 Wall Street, Room 2200, New York, N.Y. 10005

Haynes (John Randolph and Dora Haynes) Foundation, 607 South Hill Street, Los Angeles, CA 90014

Irwin Foundation, 2121 West 21st Street, Chicago, Ill.

---

[1] Tilden J. LeMelle and Wilbert J. LeMelle, The Black College: A Strategy for Relevancy (New York: Frederick A. Praeger Publishers [Praeger Special Studies in United States Economic and Social Development], 1969), pp. 137-139.

Jelke Foundation, 40 Wall Street, New York, N.Y. 10005

Kade Foundation, 100 Church Street, Room 1604, New York, N.Y. 10007

Kenan Junior Charitable Trust, 120 Broadway, Room 3046, New York, N.Y. 10005

Kettering Foundation, 42 North Main Street, Dayton, Ohio

Kresge Foundation, 211 West Fort Street, Detroit, Michigan

Kress Foundation, 221 West 57th Street, New York, N.Y. 10019

Lindsay Trust, 38 Newbury Street, Boston, Massachusetts

Littauer Foundation, 345 East 46th Street, New York, N.Y. 10017

Marsden Foundation, c/o S.W. Childs Management Corporation, One Wall Street, New York, N.Y.

McCormick Charitable Trust, 435 North Michigan Avenue, Chicago, Ill.

New World Foundation, 475 Riverside Drive, New York, N.Y. 10027

New York Foundation, Four West 58th Street, New York, N.Y. 10019

Norman Fund, 575 Madison Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10022

Relm Foundation, 9021 First National Building, Ann Arbor, Michigan

Research Corporation, 405 Lexington Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10017

Resources for the Future, 1755 Massachusetts Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036

Rockefeller Foundation, 111 West 50th Street, New York, N.Y. 10020

Russell Sage Foundation, 230 Park Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10017

Schmitt Foundation, 722 First National Bank Building, Chicago, Ill.

Sloan Foundation, 630 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10020

Sullivan Foundation, 61 Broadway, New York, N.Y. 10006

Taconic Foundation, 666 Fifth Avenue, New York, N.Y. 10019

Wemyss Foundation, 200 West Ninth Street, Wilmington, Delaware

Whitehall Foundation, 111 East 59th Street, New York, N.Y. 10022

Whitney Foundation, 111 West 50th Street, New York, N.Y. 10020[2]

---

[2] For additional information on foundations and program limitations, see The Foundation Library Center, The Foundation Directory, 3rd ed. (New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1967).

## APPENDIX V-A

### THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA
### ETHNIC DISTRIBUTION OF UNDERGRADUATE
### EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITY STUDENTS (1)

| | 1966-67 | 1967-68 | Fall 1968-69 | Percent of Total EOP |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| American Indian | 5 | 5 | 27 | 1.3% |
| White | 31 | 83 | 163 | 8.0% |
| Black, Negro, or Afro-American | 222 | 490 | 960 | 47.1% |
| Mexican-American Spanish Surname | 127 | 268 | 550 | 27.0% |
| Oriental | 67 | 156 | 262 | 12.9% |
| Unidentified | 20 | 88 | 76 | 3.7% |
| Totals | 472 | 1,090 | 2,038 (2) | 100.0% |

---

(1) Does not include San Francisco

(2) Fifty-one dropped out during Fall Quarter 1968, reducing total to 1,987.

## APPENDIX V-B

### CALIFORNIA STATE COLLEGES
### ESTIMATES OF ETHNIC BACKGROUND DISTRIBUTION OF FALL 1969 EOP ENROLLEES
### BY COLLEGE AND SYSTEMWIDE

| College | Black | Mexican-American | Native American | Asian | White | Other |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Dominguez Hills | 52% | 40% | --% | 3% | 5% | --% |
| Fullerton | 39 | 37 | 5 | 1 | 8 | 10 |
| Hayward | 83 | 13 | -- | 1 | 3 | -- |
| Long Beach | 72 | 26 | 1 | 1 | -- | -- |
| Los Angeles | 48 | 48 | 1 | 2 | 1 | -- |
| San Bernardino | 50 | 50 | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| Cal Poly, K.V. | 71 | 22 | 1 | -- | 6 | -- |
| Cal Poly, SLO. | 50 | 42 | -- | 8 | -- | -- |
| Chico | 49 | 24 | 6 | -- | 20 | 1 |
| Fresno | 35 | 46 | 18 | -- | 1 | -- |
| Humboldt | 7 | 7 | 80 | -- | 6 | -- |
| Sacramento | 50 | 38 | 4 | 2 | 6 | -- |
| San Diego | 37 | 47 | 1 | 6 | 5 | 4 |
| San Fernando Valley | 52 | 45 | 1 | 1 | 1 | -- |
| San Francisco | 43 | 16 | 1 | 35 | 5 | -- |
| San Jose | 44 | 53 | -- | 2 | 1 | -- |
| Sonoma | 46 | 23 | -- | 3 | 28 | -- |
| Stanislaus | 32 | 44 | -- | 3 | 21 | -- |
| Systemwide | 48% | 36% | 6% | 3% | 6% | 1% |

(April, 1971)

## APPENDIX V-C

### UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA
### ETHNIC DISTRIBUTION IN PERCENT BY CAMPUS
### TOTAL STUDENT BODY AND EOP PARTICIPANTS
### 1969-70

| Campus | American Indian | | Black | | Mexican-American | | Chinese Japanese | | Other Asian | | White | | Other | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | St.Body | EOP | St.Body | EOP | St.Body | EOP | St.Body | EOP | St.Body | EOP | St.Body | EOP | St.Body | EOP |
| Berkeley | 1.3 | 3.9 | 3.2 | 54.4 | 2.4 | 23.9 | *12.4 | 10.9 | -- | -- | 74.9 | 4.9 | 1.3 | 3.1 |
| Davis | 0.4 | 9.0 | 2.0 | 39.0 | 2.2 | 35.0 | * 5.9 | 9.0 | -- | 1.0 | 88.2 | 6.0 | 1.3 | -- |
| Irvine | 0.2 | 1.6 | 1.7 | 58.7 | 2.5 | 33.3 | 3.4 | 1.6 | -- | -- | 91.8 | 2.4 | 0.4 | 2.4 |
| Los Angeles | 0.7 | 8.0 | 4.4 | 33.4 | 3.3 | 37.0 | 8.0 | 15.1 | 0.2 | -- | 83.4 | 4.3 | -- | -- |
| Riverside | 0.3 | 3.0 | 3.0 | 44.0 | 3.0 | 44.0 | 2.7 | 1.0 | 0.0 | -- | 89.0 | 8.0 | 2.0 | -- |
| San Diego | 0.1 | 1.6 | 1.7 | 42.1 | 1.7 | 42.1 | 3.0 | 7.4 | -- | -- | 96.1 | 4.7 | 0.1 | 2.1 |
| Santa Barbara | 0.2 | 0.0 | 1.7 | 55.1 | 2.2 | 44.8 | 2.6 | 0.0 | -- | -- | 90.1 | -- | 3.2 | -- |
| Santa Cruz | 0.2 | 4.0 | 1.8 | 35.6 | 2.5 | 40.9 | 3.5 | 2.7 | 1.0 | 4.0 | 90.4 | 10.1 | 0.6 | 2.7 |

*Includes "Other Asian"

(April, 1971)

# APPENDIX V-D

## THE CALIFORNIA STATE COLLEGES
## COMPARISON OF ETHNIC MIX, NEW FALL 1969
## EOP ENROLLEES AND TOTAL ENROLLMENT

| College | All Students | | | | | | EOP Students | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Black | M-A | Am. Indian | Asian | White | Other | Black | M-A | Am. Indian | Asian | White | Other |
| Chico | 1.3% | 0.8% | 0.2% | 2.5% | 95.0% | 0.1% | 49% | 24% | 6% | -- | 20% | 1% |
| Dominguez Hills | 15.0 | 11.0 | 1.0 | 12.0 | 61.0 | -- | 52 | 40 | -- | 2 | 12 | -- |
| Fresno | 2.7 | 5.8 | 2.1 | 4.5 | 77.1 | 4.2 | 35 | 46 | 18 | -- | 1 | -- |
| Fullerton | 1.2 | 3.1 | 0.5 | 1.4 | 93.0 | 0.8 | 39 | 37 | 5 | 1 | 8 | 10 |
| Hayward | 8.1 | 2.4 | 0.6 | 4.2 | 78.5 | 7.2 | 83 | 13 | 0 | 1 | 3 | -- |
| Humboldt* | | | Not Available | | | | 7 | 7 | 80 | -- | 6 | -- |
| Kellogg-Voorhis | 2.6 | 3.5 | 0.4 | 2.3 | 88.5 | 2.5 | 71 | 22 | 1 | -- | 6 | -- |
| Long Beach | 2.6 | 3.5 | 0.4 | 3.0 | 90.5 | -- | 72 | 26 | 1 | 1 | -- | -- |
| Los Angeles | 13.0 | 11.4 | 2.5 | 11.3 | 61.8 | -- | 48 | 49 | 1 | 2 | 1 | -- |
| Sacramento | 2.3 | 2.2 | 1.3 | 4.1 | 90.1 | -- | 50 | 38 | 4 | 2 | 6 | -- |
| San Bernardino | 4.5 | 7.5 | 0.5 | -- | 87.0 | -- | 50 | 50 | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| San Diego | | | Not Available | | | | 37 | 47 | 1 | 6 | 5 | 4 |
| San Fernando | 2.6 | 2.6 | 0.1 | 1.2 | 92.5 | -- | 52 | 45 | 1 | 1 | 1 | -- |
| San Francisco | 6.8 | 3.9 | 0.8 | 11.0 | 71.0 | 6.7 | 43 | 16 | 1 | 35 | 5 | -- |
| San Jose | 3.0 | 2.0 | 1.0 | 5.0 | 86.0 | 3.0 | -- | -- | 0 | -- | -- | -- |
| San Luis Obispo | 0.7 | 1.2 | 0.3 | 2.9 | 90.5 | 4.4 | 50 | 42 | -- | 8 | -- | -- |
| Sonoma | | | Not Available | | | | 46 | 23 | 0 | 3 | 28 | -- |
| Stanislaus | 1.2 | 4.5 | 2.4 | 2.6 | 87.4 | 2.0 | 32 | 44 | -- | 3 | 21 | -- |

*Spring Enrollee

(August, 1970)

## APPENDIX V-E

## UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA
## NUMBER AND PARTICIPATION RATES OF ETHNIC MINORITIES AT THE UNDERGRADUATE LEVEL AND IN THE E.O.P.

(Part 1)

| Campus | Black-Afro American |  |  |  | Chicano-Mexican American |  |  |  | Asian American |  |  |  | Native American |  |  |  |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
|  | Total[1] No. | % | E.O.P.[2] No. | % | Total[1] No. | % | E.O.P.[2] No. | % | Total[1] No. | % | E.O.P.[2] No. | % | Total[1] No. | % | E.O.P.[2] No. | % |
| Berkeley | 840 | 4.5 | 794 | 4.2 | 439 | 2.3 | 403 | 2.1 | 2366 | 12.6 | 215 | 1.1 | 93 | .5 | 51 | .3 |
| Davis | 185 | 1.9 | 171 | 1.7 | 171 | 1.7 | 147 | 1.5 | 531 | 5.3 | 61 | .6 | 60 | .6 | 37 | .4 |
| Irvine | 125 | 2.5 | 107 | 2.1 | 130 | 2.6 | 64 | 1.3 | 175 | 3.5 | 16 | .3 | 16 | .3 | 4 | * |
| Los Angeles | 893 | 5.0 | 563 | 3.1 | 861 | 4.8 | 487 | 2.7 | 1724 | 9.6 | 181 | 1.0 | 129 | .7 | 90 | .5 |
| Riverside | 197 | 4.2 | 106 | 2.3 | 197 | 4.2 | 97 | 2.1 | 123 | 2.6 | 4 | .1 | 25 | .5 | 8 | .2 |
| San Diego | 172 | 4.0 | 195 | 4.5 | 194 | 4.5 | 194 | 4.5 | 158 | 3.7 | 22 | .5 | 21 | .5 | 4 | * |
| Santa Barbara | 283 | 2.4 | 301 | 2.6 | 377 | 3.2 | 283 | 2.4 | 388 | 3.3 | 27 | .2 | 69 | .6 | 4 | * |
| Santa Cruz | 66 | 1.9 | 65 | 1.9 | 113 | 3.2 | 100 | 2.9 | 150 | 4.3 | 15 | .4 | 15 | .4 | 9 | .3 |
| Total University | 2761 | 3.6 | 2302 | 3.0 | 2482 | 3.2 | 1775 | 2.3 | 5615 | 7.3 | 541 | .7 | 428 | .6 | 207 | .3 |
| E.O.P. Participation Rate[3] | 83% |  |  |  | 72% |  |  |  | 10% |  |  |  | 48% |  |  |  |

## APPENDIX V-E

(Part 2)

| Campus | White, Foreign and Other | | | | All Students | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Total | | E.O.P.[2] | | Total Undergrads. | Minority[1] | | E.O.P.[2] | |
| | No. | % | No. | % | No. | No. | % | No. | % |
| Berkeley | 15,084 | 80.1 | 87 | .5 | 18,822 | 3,738 | 19.9 | 1,550 | 8.2 |
| Davis | 9,025 | 90.5 | 48 | .5 | 9,972 | 947 | 9.5 | 464 | 4.7 |
| Irvine | 4,608 | 91.2 | 36 | .7 | 5,054 | 446 | 8.8 | 227 | 4.5 |
| Los Angeles | 14,402 | 80.0 | 123 | .7 | 18,009 | 3,607 | 20.0 | 1,444 | 8.0 |
| Riverside | 4,131 | 88.4 | 18 | .4 | 4,673 | 542 | 11.6 | 233 | 5.0 |
| San Diego | 3,765 | 87.4 | 17 | .4 | 4,310 | 545 | 12.6 | 434 | 10.0 |
| San Diego | 10,681 | 90.5 | 27 | .2 | 11,798 | 1,117 | 9.5 | 642 | 5.4 |
| Santa Cruz | 3,151 | 90.2 | 13 | .4 | 3,495 | 344 | 9.8 | 202 | 5.8 |
| Total University | 64,847 | 85.2 | 369 | .5 | 76,133 | 11,286 | 14.8 | 5,196** | 6.8 |
| E.O.P. Participation[3] Rate | | 0.6% | | | | | | | |

1. All total columns are from Fall 1970 Ethnic Survey dated March 10, 1971; voluntary survey, the data is not 100% accurate.
2. From campus E.O.P. Reports for academic year 1970-71.
3. Percent of undergraduate students by ethnic group dependent on E.O.P. supporting services, financial aids, tutoring, counseling, etc.

* Too small to calculate %.

** Ethnic identity of 25 students unknown.

Source: Office of the President, Item for Information, Berkeley, California, Report on University of California Undergraduate Educational Opportunity Program, 1970-1971 (an unpublished document, prepared for meeting January 20, 1972). January, 1972.

## APPENDIX VI-A

## UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA
## EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITY PROGRAM STUDENTS
## BY ADMISSIONS CLASSIFICATION AND MEDIAN GRADE POINT AVERAGE

| Admissions Classification | 1966-67 | | 1967-68 | | (Fall) 1968-69 | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Number | GPA | Number | GPA | Number | GPA |
| Academically Eligible Freshmen | 166 | 2.41 | 306 | 2.30 | 287 | 2.47 |
| Academically Eligible Transfers | 48 | 2.66 | 106 | 2.48 | 106 | 2.47 |
| Special Action Freshmen | 75 | 2.05 | 143 | 2.04 | 327 | 2.00 |
| Special Action Transfers | 65 | 2.20 | 139 | 2.32 | 209 | 2.27 |
| Continuing Eligible Students | 106 | 2.40 | 298 | 2.43 | 666 | 2.52 |
| Continuing Special Action | 12 | 1.73 | 98 | 2.27 | 392 | 2.15 |
| Totals | 472 | | 1,090 | | 1,987 | |

## APPENDIX VI-B

### SUMMARY OF ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE, FOR THE CALIFORNIA STATE COLLEGES DURING THE FIRST YEAR OF PERSISTENCE, AND DISQUALIFICATION OF FALL 1968 E.O.P. ENROLLEES

| COLLEGE & (1) | | ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE (year end) | | | WITHDRAWALS | | DISQUALIFICATIONS | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Below "C" | "C" or Better | "B" or Better(2) | Fall (3) | Spring (4) | End of Fall | End of Spring |
| Dominguez Hills | ( 34) | 9 | 22 | ( 3) | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Fullerton | ( 52) | 27 | 22 | ( 2) | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Hayward | (123) | 34 | 58 | ( 4) | 28 | 2 | 0 | 3 |
| Long Beach | (341) | 131 | 183 | (19) | 5 | 20 | 1 | 3 |
| Los Angeles | ( 93) | 30 | 45 | ( 7) | 16 | 2 | 2 | 42 |
| San Bernardino | ( 11) | 4 | 5 | ( 2) | 2 | 0 | 0 | 10 |
| San Luis Obispo | ( 22) | 14 | 6 | ( 1) | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Chico | ( 88) | 31 | 42 | ( 2) | 8 | 7 | 0 | 1 |
| Fresno | ( 78) | 32 | 43 | ( 1) | 2 | 1 | 0 | 3 |
| Sacramento | ( 54) | 21 | 23 | ( 5) | 10 | 0 | 0 | 12 |
| San Diego | (364) | 142 | 212 | (41) | 3 | 5 | 0 | 0 |
| San Fernando | (229) | 85 | 118 | (14) | 14 | 12 | 7 | 28 |
| San Jose | (420) | 121 | 257 | (42) | 17 | 13 | 0 | 40 |
| Sonoma | ( 63) | 8 | 44 | (13) | 7 | 4 | 12 | 26 |
| Stanislaus | ( 10) | 5 | 5 | ( 0) | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 |
| Total | (1982) | 694 | 1085 | (156) | 120 | 69 | 22 | 169 |
| | | 39% | 61% | (9%) | 9% | | 9% | |

(1) Data not yet available for San Francisco. Humboldt and Cal Poly Pomona did not have programs in 1968-69.

(2) Numbers in this column also included in "C or Better" column.

(3) Includes those who completed Fall term, but did not re-enroll in Spring.

(4) Spring withdrawals may be included in grade distribution columns where withdrawan occurred late in term due to assignment of WF's (withdrawing failures).

Source: Statement of Robert O. Bess, Director of Special Projects and Academic Affairs, and Kenneth S. Washington, Assistant Dean, Student Affairs, The California State Colleges, Los Angeles, CA. (Statement prepared for the Subcommittee 4B of the Assembly Ways and Means Committee, Dec. 4, 1969, an unpublished document), 1969.

## APPENDIX VI-C
## THE CALIFORNIA STATE COLLEGES
## PERSISTENCE, PROBATION AND DISQUALIFICATION DATA, FALL 1969, EOP ENROLLEES*

| Campus | Percent Disq. | Of Those Not Completing Year<br>Percent Not Return | Percent Fall | Withdrawing Winter | Spring | Those Completing Year: Percent on Probation<br>Group A | Group B | Group C |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Chico | 0% | 6% | 0% | 0 | 3% | 24% | 20% | 0% |
| Dominguez Hills | 9 | 9 | 0 | 3 | 12 | 28 | 0 | 0 |
| Fresno | 0 | 4 | 4 | 0 | 2 | 35 | 0 | 0 |
| Fullerton | 4 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 35 | 0 | 10 |
| Hayward | 0 | 3 | 9 | 3 | 9 | 25 | 0 | 30 |
| Humboldt |  | Not Available |  |  |  | Not Available |  |  |
| Kellogg-Voorhis | 0 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 35 | 22 | 0 |
| Long Beach | 0 | 2 | 5 | 0 | 3 | 14 | 15 | 29 |
| Los Angeles | 0 | 4 | 0.5 | 9 | 2 | 38 | 44 | 30 |
| Sacramento | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 44 | 0 | 12 |
| San Bernardino | 0 | 7 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 50 | 18 | 0 |
| San Diego | 0 | 7 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 17 | 0 | 18 |
| San Fernando | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 24 | 10 | 20 |
| San Francisco | 0 | 1.6 | 0 | 0 | 1.6 | 16 | 0 | 13 |
| San Jose | 0 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 25 | 8 | 22 |
| San Luis Obispo | 0 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 50 | 0 | -- |
| Sonoma | 0 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 31 | 14 | 0 |
| Stanislaus | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 28 | 0 | -- |

* Based upon randomly selected samples.

(August, 1970)

## APPENDIX VI-D

### THE CALIFORNIA STATE COLLEGES
### ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE DATA FALL 1969, EOP ENROLLEES*

| College | Sample Size | GROUP A** Mean EOP GPA | GROUP A** Mean Reg. GPA | GROUP B Mean EOP GPA | GROUP B Mean Reg. GPA | GROUP C Mean EOP GPA | GROUP C Mean Reg. GPA | ALL EOP Mean GPA |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Chico | 40% | 2.26 | 2.69 | 2.64 | 2.66 | 2.30 | 2.59 | 2.38 |
| Dominguez Hills | 44% | 1.78 | 2.33 | 1.55 | N/A | 2.62 | 2.56 | 1.88 |
| Fresno | 33% | 2.18 | 2.50 | 2.53 | 2.25 | 2.00 | 2.25 | 2.09 |
| Fullerton | 31% | 2.10 | N/A | 2.27 | N/A | 2.35 | N/A | 2.17 |
| Hayward | 32% | 2.57 | 2.51 | 2.38 | 2.59 | 2.39 | 2.61 | 2.46 |
| Humboldt | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| Kellogg-Voorhis | 61% | 1.98 | 2.28 | 2.12 | 2.48 | 2.60 | 2.49 | 2.18 |
| Long Beach | 26% | 2.35 | 2.44 | 2.38 | 2.51 | 2.44 | 2.52 | 2.38 |
| Los Angeles | 20% | 1.73 | N/A | 1.87 | N/A | 2.09 | N/A | 1.83 |
| Sacramento | 30% | 2.08 | 2.53 | 2.54 | 2.64 | 2.59 | 2.79 | 2.31 |
| San Bernardino | 100% | 1.02 | 2.33 | 2.41 | 2.40 | 2.72 | 2.58 | 1.85 |
| San Diego | 27% | 2.05 | 2.62 | 2.78 | 2.62 | 2.54 | 2.88 | 2.35 |
| San Fernando | 24% | 2.05 | 2.15 | 2.67 | 2.25 | 2.51 | 2.37 | 2.37 |
| San Francisco | 21% | 2.44 | 2.75 | 2.68 | 2.75 | 2.31 | 2.91 | 2.47 |
| San Jose | 20% | 2.15 | 2.30 | 2.67 | 2.55 | 2.35 | 2.54 | 2.38 |
| San Luis Obispo | 100% | 2.03 | 2.26 | 2.78 | 2.46 | -- | -- | 2.24 |
| Sonoma | 100% | 2.46 | N/A | 2.26 | N/A | 3.27 | N/A | 2.43 |
| Stanislaus | 100% | 2.15 | 2.54 | 2.43 | 2.64 | -- | -- | 2.21 |

---

* Information based upon randomly selected samples of EOP students who did not meet regular admissions requirements. Sample sizes range from 20% to 100% of exception and special basis of admission categories.

**Group A consists of those students who had completed fewer than 30 semester units (45 quarter units at the end of Spring 1970; Group B, completed less than 60 (90); Group C 60 (90) or more.

(August, 1970)

## APPENDIX VI-E

### CALIFORNIA STATE COLLEGES
### FALL 1969 E.O.P. ENROLLEES NOT MEETING REGULAR ADMISSION REQUIREMENTS
### PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS EARNING "C" (2.00) OR BETTER AND "B" (3.00) OR BETTER DURING FIRST YEAR OF STATE COLLEGE ENROLLMENT BY COLLEGE AND BY BASIS OF ADMISSION

| College | First-Time Freshmen | | Transfer Exceptions | | Other Transfers | | Total | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | "C" or Better | "B" or Better | "C" or Better | "B" or Better | "C" or Better | "B" or Better | "C" or Better | "B" or Better |
| Dominguez Hills | 57.9% | 5.3% | 57.1% | 21.4% | 100 % | --% | --% | --% |
| Fullerton | 61.3 | 6.5 | 90.9 | 18.2 | 83.3 | 16.7 | 70.8 | 14.7 |
| Hayward | 63.7 | 10.5 | 84.6 | 7.6 | -- | -- | 78.1 | 9.4 |
| Long Beach | 88.9 | 17.8 | 66.7 | 11.1 | 66.7 | 33.3 | 79.5 | 16.7 |
| Los Angeles | 36 | -- | 62 | 6 | 64 | 9 | 48 | 3 |
| San Bernardino | 38.5 | -- | 80 | 30 | 100 | 100 | 60 | 20 |
| Cal Poly, K.V. | 60 | -- | 76.2 | 4.8 | 100 | -- | 70.5 | 2.3 |
| Cal Poly, SLO. | 63 | -- | 50 | 50 | -- | -- | 50 | 10.0 |
| Chico | 77.3 | 9.1 | 80 | 20 | -- | -- | 78.1 | 12.5 |
| Fresno | 69.5 | 8.7 | 76.5 | -- | 66.7 | -- | 71.7 | 4.3 |
| Sacramento | 73.3 | 6.7 | 83.3 | 25 | 80 | 20 | 79.6 | 18.4 |
| San Diego | 61.9 | 14.3 | 94.7 | 36.8 | 75 | 25 | 77.3 | 25 |
| San Fernando Valley | 76.3 | 23.6 | 57.9 | 15.8 | 87.5 | 37.5 | 73.2 | 23.2 |
| San Francisco | 87.5 | 37.5 | 76.9 | 26.5 | 90 | 30 | 80 | 31.7 |
| San Jose | 63.6 | 34 | 83.3 | 25 | 66.7 | 11.1 | 67.6 | 29.4 |
| Sonoma | 75 | 41.6 | 75 | 35 | -- | -- | 75 | 37.5 |
| Stanislaus | 75 | 6.7 | 100 | -- | 66.7 | 33.3 | 77.3 | 9.1 |
| Systemwide | 67% | 14.8% | 74.8% | 18.3% | 77.2% | 21.5% | 70.9% | 16.7% |

(April, 1971)

## APPENDIX VI-F

### CALIFORNIA STATE COLLEGES
### FALL 1969 E.O.P. ENROLLEES, MEDIAN GRADE POINT AVERAGE, MEDIAN UNITS SUCCESSFULLY COMPLETED, AND PERCENTAGE OF ENROLLEES SUCCESSFULLY COMPLETING 20 OR MORE SEMESTER UNITS, BY COLLEGE AND SYSTEMWIDE

| College | Median GPA | Median Units Completed (1) | | Percent Completing and Passing 20 or More Units |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Enrolled Full Year | Enrolled Part Year | |
| Dominguez Hills | 2.09 | 17.9 | 6.5 | 39 |
| Fullerton | 2.23 | 22.5 | 6.7 | 61 |
| Hayward | 2.56 | 22.8 | 9.4 | 65 |
| Long Beach | 2.44 | 22.5 | 5.0 | 67 |
| Los Angeles | 1.96 | 23.2 | 8.6 | 60 |
| San Bernardino | 2.21 | 26.5 | 8.1 | 76 |
| Cal Poly, K.V. | 2.23 | 22.1 | 8.8 | 64 |
| Cal Poly, SLO. | 2.13 | 25.8 | 7.5 | 100 |
| Chico | 2.46 | 26.5 | 5.0 | 83 |
| Fresno | 2.33 | 21.8 | 5.0 | 64 |
| Sacramento | 2.42 | 24.3 | 5.0 | 70 |
| San Diego | 2.58 | 24.1 | 3.1 | 66 |
| San Fernando Valley | 2.50 | 27.8 | 5.0 | 85 |
| San Francisco | 2.61 | 21.1 | 11.3 | 55 |
| San Jose | 2.53 | 27.6 | 8.8 | 82 |
| Sonoma | 2.75 | 23.1 | 2.5 | 58 |
| Stanislaus | 2.21 | 26.7 | 10.0 | 90 |
| Systemwide | 2.34 | 23.5 | 7.2 | 67 |

(1) Quarter college entries have been converted to semester units to facilitate comparisons.

* All entries for units completed refer to units earned in courses in which passing grades were earned. They do not include incompletes, failures and withdrawals.

(April, 1971)

# APPENDIX VI-G

## UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA
## NEW EOP STUDENTS 1969-70 WHO COMPLETED SPRING QUARTER 1970 (1)

| Campus | First-time Freshmen | | | | Lower Division Transfers | | | | Upper Division Transfers | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Regular | | Special | | Regular | | Special | | Regular | | Special | |
| | No. Stds. | Med. GPA | No. Stds. | Med. GPA | No. Stds. | Med. GPA | No. Stds. | Med. GPA | No. Stds. | Med. GPA | No. Stds. | Med. GPA |
| Berkeley | 83 | 2.71 | 117 | 2.44 | 15 | 2.61 | 194 | 2.65 | 70 | 2.80 | 54 | 2.45 |
| Davis | 19 | 2.54 | 67 | 2.44 | 3 | 2.06 | 71 | 2.43 | 7 | 2.81 | 8 | 3.21 |
| Irvine | 4 | 2.77 | 32 | 3.00 | 4 | 2.49 | 26 | 3.00 | 4 | 2.72 | 5 | 2.57 |
| Los Angeles | 82 | 2.63 | 57 | 2.33 | 16 | 2.80 | 56 | 2.49 | 44 | 2.66 | 19 | 2.36 |
| Riverside | 16 | 2.68 | 32 | 2.58 | 6 | 3.14 | 8 | 2.73 | 2 | 3.03 | 4 | 2.77 |
| San Diego | 20 | 2.33 | 55 | 2.40 | 7 | 3.00 | 19 | 2.56 | 5 | 2.83 | 3 | 2.50 |
| Santa Barbara | 45 | 2.72 | 74 | 2.56 | 6 | 2.75 | 43 | 2.76 | 20 | 2.63 | 20 | 2.86 |

---

(1) Excludes students at Santa Cruz under pass-fail grading system.

(April, 1971)

## APPENDIX VI-G (Continued)

## EOP STUDENTS 1969-70 WHO COMPLETED SPRING QUARTER 1970(1)

| Campus | Admitted as Freshmen | | | | Admitted as Lower Division Transfers | | | | Admitted as Upper Division Transfers | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Regular | | Special | | Regular | | Special | | Regular | | Special | |
| | No. Stds. | Med. GPA | No. Stds. | Med. GPA | No. Stds. | Med. GPA | No. Stds. | Med. GPA | No. Stds. | Med. GPA | No. Stds. | Med. GPA |
| Berkeley | 124 | 2.88 | 117 | 2.66 | 16 | 2.98 | 196 | 2.75 | 49 | 2.84 | 54 | 2.65 |
| Davis | 28 | 2.53 | 65 | 2.36 | 15 | 2.67 | 56 | 2.74 | 9 | 2.69 | 7 | 2.29 |
| Irvine | 1 | 2.35 | 14 | 2.51 | -- | -- | 18 | 2.75 | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| Los Angeles | 238 | 2.58 | 83 | 2.46 | 27 | 2.81 | 79 | 2.59 | 42 | 2.68 | 19 | 2.41 |
| Riverside | 29 | 2.83 | 22 | 2.41 | 4 | 2.39 | 14 | 2.76 | 3 | 2.93 | 4 | 2.76 |
| San Diego | 32 | 2.63 | 9 | 2.25 | 5 | 2.89 | 14 | 2.38 | 2 | 2.60 | 5 | 2.46 |
| Santa Barbara | 83 | 2.79 | 76 | 2.65 | 3 | 2.97 | 41 | 2.89 | 12 | 3.12 | 8 | 2.42 |

---

(1) Excludes students at Santa Cruz under pass-fail grading system.

(April, 1971)

## APPENDIX VI-H

## UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA
## NEW EOP STUDENTS 1969-70 WHO DID NOT COMPLETE SPRING QUARTER 1970(1)

| Campus | First-time Freshmen | | | | Lower Division Transfers | | | | Upper Division Transfers | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Regular | | Special | | Regular | | Special | | Regular | | Special | |
| | No. Stds. | Med. GPA | No. Stds. | Med. GPA | No. Stds. | Med. GPA | No. Stds. | Med. GPA | No. Stds. | Med. GPA | No. Stds. | Med. GPA |
| Berkeley | 3 | 2.28 | 27 | 1.30 | -- | -- | 20 | 1.69 | 5 | 2.50 | 6 | 1.99 |
| Davis | -- | -- | 7 | .50 | -- | -- | 7 | 2.13 | -- | -- | 4 | 2.35 |
| Irvine | 3 | 1.15 | 2 | 2.18 | -- | -- | 2 | 2.11 | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| Los Angeles | 11 | 1.55 | 8 | 1.47 | 5 | 1.80 | 12 | 1.67 | 5 | 2.51 | 1 | -- |
| Riverside | -- | -- | 4 | 1.70 | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| San Diego | -- | -- | 1 | 1.00 | -- | -- | 1 | 2.67 | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| Santa Barbara | -- | -- | 3 | 1.66 | -- | -- | 4 | 2.61 | -- | -- | 3 | .66 |

(1) Excludes students at Santa Cruz under pass-fail grading system.

(April, 1971)

## APPENDIX VI-H (Continued)

## EOP STUDENTS 1969-70 WHO DID NOT COMPLETE SPRING QUARTER 1970[1][2]

| Campus | Admitted as Freshmen | | | | Admitted as Lower Division Transfers | | | | Admitted as Upper Division Transfers | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Regular | | Special | | Regular | | Special | | Regular | | Special | |
| | No. Stds. | Med. GPA | No. Stds. | Med. GPA | No. Stds. | Med. GPA | No. Stds. | Med. GPA | No. Stds. | Med. GPA | No. Stds. | Med. GPA |
| Berkeley | 10 | 2.81 | 36 | 1.45 | 5 | 3.22 | 58 | 2.32 | 20 | 2.86 | 14 | 2.34 |
| Davis | 2 | 2.45 | 2 | 1.88 | -- | -- | 7 | 2.36 | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| Irvine | -- | -- | 2 | 2.90 | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| Los Angeles | 56 | 2.54 | 27 | 2.27 | 5 | 2.33 | 11 | 2.20 | 6 | 2.65 | 3 | 2.33 |
| Riverside | 3 | 1.79 | 1 | -- | -- | -- | 1 | 2.24 | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| San Diego | 2 | 2.08 | 5 | 2.00 | -- | -- | 2 | .80 | -- | -- | -- | -- |
| Santa Barbara | 7 | 2.60 | 6 | 1.97 | -- | -- | 5 | 2.72 | 1 | 3.60 | -- | -- |

(1) Excludes students at Santa Cruz under pass-fail grading system.

(2) Includes 94 students who graduated prior to the Spring quarter.

(April, 1971)